

5-15-1970

Post-Divorce Visitation of Minor Children; An Exploratory Study

Barbara Griffith

Portland State University

Gladys Hack

Portland State University

Eileen Murphy

Portland State University

Allison Wieman

Portland State University

Adam Williams

Portland State University

See next page for additional authors

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds



Part of the [Social Work Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Griffith, Barbara; Hack, Gladys; Murphy, Eileen; Wieman, Allison; Williams, Adam; VanLydegraf, Earl; and Glaudin, Vincent, "Post-Divorce Visitation of Minor Children; An Exploratory Study" (1970). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 1747.

[10.15760/etd.1745](https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds/10.15760/etd.1745)

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. For more information, please contact pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

Author

Barbara Griffith, Gladys Hack, Eileen Murphy, Allison Wieman, Adam Williams, Earl VanLydegraf, and
Vincent Glaudin

A B S T R A C T

POST-DIVORCE VISITATION OF MINOR CHILDREN AN EXPLORATORY STUDY

Prepared By

Barbara Griffith
Gladys Hack
Eileen Murphy
Allison Wieman
Alan Williams
Earl Van Lydegraf

Directed By

Vincent Glaudin, Ph.D.

ORS 107.100 gives the court broad powers to secure the "best interests" of minor children as third parties to a divorce. Further, the Oregon Supreme Court has ruled in Tingen vs. Tingen that the best interests of a minor child involve a complex constellation of factors pertaining to the parents, the environment, and the adjustment of the child. It has been assumed in case law that "reasonable visitation" of the minor child by the non-custodial parent is usually in the best interests of the child and is a "right" of the non-custodial parent. Most judges order reasonable visitation as part of the divorce decree, especially in the vast number of default decrees. In some instances, specific visitation arrangements are ordered and custody counseling frequently helps to develop an acceptable visitation plan. The fact is, however, that little is known about reasonable visitation; the patterns which exist, the decision making process, and the impact of visitation on the best interests of the minor child.

The present exploratory study examined the feasibility of selecting and interviewing a representative sample of divorced parents with minor children in order to increase our understanding of visitation by the non-custodial parent. Two sampling studies were carried out, one in the Portland metropolitan area and one in Benton County. It was found that a significant sampling bias developed in contacting divorced parents when telephone listings provided the main system for tracing subjects. This bias was less pronounced for recent divorces.

Once actual contact was made with subjects, they tended to be cooperative in agreeing to be interviewed. Of those who agreed, twenty-four were selected to participate in a semi-structured interview concerning visitation. It was determined on this admittedly small and biased sample, that "frequent" visitation meant about "once a week" for recently divorced couples; "twice a month", for those divorced three to five years. A striking finding was that the minor child played a significant role in determining the frequency and activities of visitation starting at about eight years of age and universally by ten years of age. There appeared to be more strife in the visitation arrangements of recently divorced parents, some of whom were still deeply involved in bids for reconciliation or vindictiveness.

The paper cautions against the assumption that promoting visitation is in the best interests of the minor child. Our state of knowledge counsels modesty in our advice. In regard to further research, two broad negative conclusions were reached: a) telephone listings do not provide a feasible means of securing a representative sample; b) a cross-sectional study, involving parents divorced several years, introduces an extreme

sample bias. It is recommended that a short-term longitudinal strategy to be followed, possibly with cases selected from the court's docket prior to the divorce decree. A one-year longitudinal study would provide a significant range of visitation patterns and opportunity to evaluate the impact of remarriage on visitation in a substantial number of cases. It would be important to include some systematic description of the minor child's adjustment in order to relate visitation to the criterion of the "best interests" of the child.

POST-DIVORCE VISITATION OF MINOR CHILDREN:
AN EXPLORATORY STUDY

prepared by
Barbara Griffith
Gladys Hack
Eileen Murphy
Alison Wieman
Alan Williams
Earl Van Lydegraf

Social Work 501 and 502
Research Practicum

directed by
Vincent Glaudin, Ph.D.

Portland State University

May 15, 1970

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Special appreciation is expressed to Judge Jean Lewis whose concern for the minor children of divorced parents stimulated this exploratory study. Mr. Richard Collins helped channel that concern in the direction of an investigation and he aided with the resources of the Family Services Department. Thanks are warmly extended to Judge Richard Mengler, who made it possible for this study to be extended from Portland to Benton County. The research team also wishes to acknowledge the special contributions of Dr. Arthur Emlen, who provided resource material and offered his expertise in considering the methodological questions which grew out of this pilot project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	1
+	A. Oregon Law	1
	B. Purpose and Overview	2
	C. Local Background	4
	D. Literature Review	7
II.	Sampling Feasibility Studies	15
	A. Metropolitan Portland Study	16
	B. Benton County Study	24
	C. Conclusions and Comparisons	33
III.	Semi-Structured Interviews	36
+	IV. Conclusions, Problems and Possibilities	47
	V. Bibliography	55
VI.	Appendixes	58
+	A. Perspectives on Divorce American Style	58
	B. Supplementary Data from Goode's Research	76
	C. Visitation Essays	79
	1. Essay Outline	79
	2. Essay by Non-Custodial Father	81
	D. Official Forms for Subject Pool Data	85
	1. Bureau of Vital Statistics	85
	2. Support Card Files	86
	E. Guidelines for Contacts with Subjects	87
	1. Telephone	87
	2. Letter	88

F. Semi-Structured Interviews.....	89
1. Guidelines.....	89
2. Twenty-four Case Summaries	90
G. Proto-Type Interview Schedules.....	145
1. Non-Custodial Parent.....	145
2. Custodial Parent.....	159

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Oregon Law

The legal framework in the State of Oregon--by legislation, by precedent-setting Supreme Court decisions, by judicial custom--gives the court broad responsibilities and sweeping powers in insuring "the best interests" of minor children who are third parties to a divorce action. ORS 107.100, "Provisions of Decree of Divorce or Annulment," states that the court has the power to decree as follows:

1. (a) For the future care and custody of the minor children of the marriage as it may deem just and proper. In determining custody, the court shall consider the best interests of the child and the past conduct and demonstrated moral standards of each of the parties. No preference in custody shall be given to the mother over the father for the sole reason that she is the mother.
2. (b) For the recovery from the party not allowed the care and custody of such children, such amount of money, in gross or in installments, or both, as may be just and proper for such party to contribute toward the nurture and education of such children.

It has been customary to grant the non-custodial parent "reasonable and seasonal visitation" with his children. Visitation is not specifically a matter of statute but has been established by case law.* Ordinarily, the divorced parents and their attorneys agree to the details of visitation, often in the context of a general property settlement

*Consultation with several Portland attorneys and a legal search by the U. S. Attorney's Office for Oregon.

and the establishment of proper support payments. When the divorcing parents are not able to reach agreement concerning "reasonable visitation," the court has the authority to order custody counseling to facilitate some decisions or the court may order explicit conditions of visitation arbitrarily.

In a recent Oregon Supreme Court decision (*Tingen v. Tingen*, 1968), the complexity of these issues is further elaborated. The Supreme Court ruled that the "best interests of the child" cannot be reduced to a single factor. The trial judge must take into account the entire situation:

"In determining the best interests of a child in a custody dispute the court ought to consider all the relevant factors. These, as we see them, would generally include: (1) the conduct of the parties; (2) the moral, emotional and physical fitness of the parties; (3) the comparative physical environments; (4) the emotional ties of the child to other family members; (5) the interest of the parties in, and the attitude toward, the child; (6) the age, sex, and health of the child; (7) the desirability of continuing an existing relationship and environment; and (8) the preference of the child."

It is clear then that in custody issues, including visitation arrangements, the court has extremely broad responsibilities and powers. These responsibilities and powers are to take into consideration very complex configurations of factors in reaching decisions in the best interests of the child.

B. Purpose and Overview

This study represents the initial stage of investigation of post-divorce visitation of minor children by the non-custodial parent. Ultimately, the purpose of this kind of research is to describe

patterns of visitation and how they evolve over time. As studies along these lines develop, a long range goal is to understand the decision making process which establishes and modifies the visiting arrangement. Of particular importance in the long run is gaining insight into the impact of the visitation pattern on the welfare of the individual dependent child. The immediate objective of this study, however, was to explore approaches to interviewing a representative sample of divorced parents.

As the research team familiarized itself with the broad issues of post-divorce visitation, several specific sub-goals emerged which seemed within reach and which constitute the content of this paper:

- 1) Providing a review of the limited literature directly pertaining to visitation and to place this in the context of divorce in the United States;
- 2) Comparing techniques for selecting divorced parents to be interviewed and determining the degree of their cooperation;
- 3) Establishing the availability and cooperation of recently divorced parents compared to those divorced for approximately five years;
- 4) Testing techniques of sample selection in an urban and rural setting;
- 5) Conducting a limited number of semi-structured interviews to gain initial experience as well as to provide the first, tentative content which might be given as feedback to agents of the court;
- 6) Developing a crude, proto-type interview schedule which might serve as a starting point for pre-testing in a next stage of research.

C. Local Background

The number of children affected by divorce is enormous and appears to be ever-growing because of the increasing commonness of divorce and some indication that divorcing families are not deterred by the factor of having minor children. Locally, the trend toward a higher divorce rate has been observed. In populous Multnomah County, for instance, there were 1,957 divorces in 1965 and 3,706 in 1969. This represents a rise from 3.5 to 4.6 divorces per thousand population. Of the 1969 divorces, 1,300 cases involved families with minor children. In rural Benton County, the ratio went from 2.48 divorces per thousand population in 1965 to 3.16 per thousand in 1969, so the dissolution of marriages is not just an urban phenomenon. Of the 161 divorces granted last year in Benton County, 57% involved cases with children under 18, approximately two children per divorcing couple. (All data from the Oregon Bureau of Vital Statistics.)

Portland has long been aware of the social problems associated with family disorganization by divorce and has established a variety of services to cope with them. As early as 1948, a Portland City Club study, Divorce and Children of Divorce, helped focus concern. It was a full fifteen years later, however, before the Family Services Department of the Multnomah County Court of Domestic Relations was established.

"The Family Services Department provides a parallel marriage and family counseling service to the Court of Domestic Relations. Its goal is to provide a constructive alternative to divorce and/or extensive conflict and litigation over the custody of the children of divorced parents. In addition to the counseling carried out by the Marriage and Family Counselors, they act as expert witnesses to the Court when couples are not able to solve their problems out of court."

(Family Services Department, 1970-71)

The importance of cases involving parents of minor children can be seen in the figures provided by the Family Services Department which indicate that custody cases have been steadily on the increase while conciliation cases have remained in the range of 726 to 777 per year. Custody cases have risen the last three fiscal years from 141 to 248 to 444. It is estimated that 80% of these custody cases with short-term counseling are able to settle their problems out of court. Of course, an important feature of the counseling in these cases is the agreement to a particular visiting arrangement for the non-custodial parent. The counselors attempt to reduce the bitterness between divorcing parents and to enhance their capacity to carry out a parent role in the best interests of the children.

The Honorable Judge Jean L. Lewis, Multnomah County Superior Court, like the other judges of this court and the counselors of Family Services Department, has been deeply concerned about the welfare of minor children as third parties to a divorce. Judge Lewis (1969) has been especially plagued by "problem cases" which return to court for hearings pertaining to the modification of custody and visiting arrangements, since so many of these seem to make the child a pawn in a continuing battle between ex-spouses. In the same way, Family Service Department counselors are likely to be confronted by the most difficult cases. Little is known about the vast majority of divorces that efficiently pass through the process of default decrees. Here, counseling in regard to visitation is provided by attorneys, often with skill, but with the handicap of an adversary context where genuine communication between parents is extremely difficult. It has been said

frequently that zealous lawyers may widen the gap of understanding between the two spouses by attempts to show that the fault lies on the other side. Discussions about minor children--custody and visitation--may take place in an economically-toned dialogue about support payments and "dividing the spoils." (Leslie, 1967).

Judge Richard Mengler (1970), presiding judge of the Circuit Court serving Benton County, states that he follows the usual practice of ordering "reasonable visitation" but that he is sensitive to the pitfalls of this broad directive, especially in regard to problems inherent in the remarriage of the custodial mother. His concern about this problem has been heightened by the rising number of divorces he has granted to parents with minor children: 68 in 1965; 92 in 1969.

According to ORS 107.100, the presiding judge has the broad responsibility of securing the welfare of the children of the divorcing parents while case law establishes the rights of parents to have contact with their children. Wherever possible, the broad guideline of "reasonable visitation" is ordered by the court with the burden of responsibility falling on the divorcing parents and their attorneys to work out the details of the arrangement. Little is known about the variety of ways that these arrangements are actually worked out and how the arrangements contribute to the best interests of the children. Agents of the court, judges and counselors alike, have few legal or scientific landmarks to utilize in speaking authoritatively about what "reasonable visitation" should be, especially in terms of its role in facilitating the development of the child.

As a result of these shared concerns about the meaning of "reasonable visitation," a research question began to take shape. It

was Judge Lewis together with Richard Collins, director of the Family Services Department, however, who translated the broad discussion about visitation into a concrete request for a study. They asked for an investigation which might take a step toward promoting meaningful parental contact between the child and the non-custodial parent and to shed light on the process which leads to successful arrangements without the destructive, costly courtroom battles which often appear more symptomatic than problem solving.

D. Literature Review*

A search of the scientific and professional sources revealed that little of high quality was unearthed directly relevant to the topic of visitation arrangements. What was found tended to be narrowly legalistic, opinions of counselors, or incidental research findings in the examination of post-divorce adjustment. One research project stood out as directly contributing to our knowledge and special attention is given to it here.

1) Research Findings

a) Goode (1956) has reported on an interview research project conducted in 1948 where more than 400 metropolitan Detroit women between 20 and 38 years of age were asked to respond to questions directly pertinent to the description of visitation. He used a carefully structured interview schedule which should have elicited reasonably reliable data; however, he notes that the women were emotionally biased and given to justification of the decision to divorce. Furthermore, Goode found that many of his original sample of randomly

*See Appendix A for a broader treatment: Perspectives on Divorce American Style.

selected divorced women were from the lower socioeconomic levels and were particularly hard to trace. He cautions that the more stable, affluent divorced parents are more likely to be available for an interview.

From his interview data, ** Goode makes the broad conclusion that marriages generally continue after the legal divorce through the lives of the children. Visitation is often the only channel through which the ex-spouses can make demands upon each other combined with the matter of child support payments. The child easily becomes a weapon to use against the former partner, either by withholding visitation or by withholding support payments. When parents had engaged in a good deal of discussion about the children prior to divorce--more child centered--there was some tendency to avoid this kind of problem. In these cases, there was a higher frequency of visitation and more interaction between the divorced couple through the children. By and large, visitation was perceived as desirable in that a little more than half of the fathers were described to be visiting "weekly or at any time" and only about a third of the mothers interviewed wanted visitation to be "less or stopped completely" (at whatever level visitation was taking place).

A number of factors contribute to a decline in visitation, many of them associated with the amount of time since the divorce. Money, distance, and the inherent tension in "passing the child back and forth" all tend to be adverse to continued visitation. The amount of "trauma" the mother experienced in the divorce and her desire to "punish" the

**See Appendix B for Supplementary Data from Goode's Research.

father appeared to be factors in diminished visitation. The mother's judgment about the "child's feelings toward his father" and whether he was "harder to handle" after visits also played a role in the evolving arrangement.

As time passes, each ex-spouse tends to develop new goals and to be less invested in the residual malice and dependency that is apparent in the immediate post-divorce period. The child himself develops a new life and becomes less focused on the visits. If the child is hurt and disappointed by the father's failure to appear for an expected visit, emotional isolation from him may take place and the child withdraws. The child's new life becomes less familiar to the father and both become less satisfactory companions for each other--at least as seen through the eyes of the mother. This finding appears to fit with Landis' report (1960) that the youngster grows closer to his custodial mother and detached from his father as a resolution of conflicting emotional allegiances.

Remarriage of the custodial mother is a significant event influencing the child's relationship with his father through the visitation arrangement. Of course, remarriage is inter-related with the amount of time since the divorce. The National Office of Vital Statistics reports that of all divorced people, 30% are remarried within one year; 50% within two years; and 75% within five years. Goode's analysis of interviews with remarried mothers concludes that most of them are satisfied with the adjustment of their children and that the remarriage tends to regularize the position of the children. In most ways, the children become more like those from unbroken homes. This squares with the report of Bell and Vogel (1962) that children are

sensitive to the social meaning of one-parent households and often urge their mothers to remarry in order to re-establish a complete family unit. Goode also points out that this reconstruction of the household gives the custodial mother a "strong hand" in dealing with her ex-husband which inevitably reflects on the visitation arrangements. Although the social position is now more complex, "both visits and battles decrease as time goes on."

b) As part of Counseling Services to Parents and Children Involved in Divorce, (1960) there is a report of assertive casework in San Bernadino, California, which in part bears on the issue of visitation. A mailed survey was conducted which offered social work services to a sample of divorced individuals. The services which were announced fell into three main categories: 1) reconciliation; 2) personal-social adjustment; 3) children. Of the 195 respondents, the category concerning children ranked lowest in their requests for services. Initially 43 S's did request interviews concerning their children; however, the number "actually" interested in children's problems shrank to 24 when interviews were initiated. Eight of the 15 mothers concerned about their children did want counseling related to visitation problems. In five cases this had to do with behavior problems allegedly aggravated by the father's visits and the other three grew out of the child's refusal to visit the father. Only one non-custodial father wanted to discuss visitation and that had to do with the awkwardness of the first visit. What does this overall lack of interest in discussing visitation arrangements mean? It may be another finding which suggests that post-divorce visitation not only fades in frequency but as an area of affective investment as time passes.

2) Anecdotal Reports and Professional Advice Concerning Visitation.

Steinzor (1969), a psychologist with experience counseling divorced parents and working with their children directly, advocates "divorce with freedom." By this he means the opposite of a "friendly divorce" which may emphasize superficial role playing "for the children's sake." He believes that much advice to divorced parents requires them to be so self-sacrificing that it is meant "for saints or hypocrites." Instead, Steinzor recommends visitation arrangements which present the opportunity for "direct dialogue and heartfelt confrontation." Both Depsert (1969), a psychiatrist and Grollman (1969), a rabbi, have drawn different conclusions from their experience with divorced parents and the welfare of their children. They both suggest the kind of guidelines that do require considerable maturity on the part of the ex-mates. For instance, they believe the parents can cooperate in planning meaningfully for a continuing relationship of the children to the father. Both parents are urged to reassure the child about this cooperation, about both guiding the child, and that both love him. Although this point of view acknowledges problems and tensions, it is felt that these are not necessarily acted out at the child's expense.

The age of the children is one of a number of factors which influence the nature of the visitation. Children under seven or eight should have regularly scheduled visits clearly specified to reduce their responsibility in the arrangement. Once the child is established in the elementary school pattern, he can be a significant person in the decision making process about arrangements for

father's visiting. This new role of the child tends to stimulate positive elements of the relationship--spontaneity, initiative, and honesty--while avoiding the empty ritual of the "Sunday Father Syndrome." As the child matures, he should have more say in all visitation arrangements, including traveling by himself and considering the plans of others. (Depsert, *ibid*)

Other factors such as the time, place, and length of visits are considered by the professionals who have worked with post-divorce adjustment. There is agreement that the disappointment of "no show" or arriving late is destructive to the child. There needs to be the kind of flexibility which allows a father to return a child early if the youngster is tired. Mandatory visiting in the custodial mother's home is viewed as a negative feature just as lengthy visits away from home may be a problem for a young child (raising anxiety about a secure base). Extended visits obviously can require a good deal of investment from the non-custodial father and provide a freeing experience for the mother who may not have had the ordinary relief from responsibility most mothers have. Fathers who take their children for a visit should make some attempt to find out what is enjoyable for the youngster, which may require special skill with a young daughter. Some kind of "privileged communication" about visits is probably desirable in contrast to the "grilling" many youngsters experience upon return home. (Groolman *ibid*; Depsert *ibid*.)

Advice, of course, is always marked by "shoulds" many of which are difficult. This is what Steinzor is criticizing. Even Rabbi Groolman acknowledges that the advice is so hard to follow that he

says "fathers don't die; they just fade away." He would confront their "rationalizations." Hunt (1966) pictures this somewhat as a choice of "fading away" or having the child feel deeply torn by increasingly different life styles between the parents. If the custodial parent does not remarry, the child may begin to use the differences between the parental life styles to manipulate them while inwardly being troubled by the inability to reconcile the conflicting standards.

3) Is Continuing Parental Visitation in the Child's Interest?

The review of the research and anecdotal literature raises a very significant question about the feasibility of a continuing, meaningful visitation arrangement with the non-custodial father that is actually of value in the child's development. The data seem to suggest that visitation diminishes in frequency and in emotional investment. There seems to be a whole range of aversive conditions which undermine an active visitation arrangement in the long run. Is this fading out of the father necessarily an "evil" when considered from the vantage point of the "best interests of the child"? (See Section I-14)

One point of view emphasizes the responsibility of the parents to plan maturely for the child, regardless of their personal conflicts, and set forth a series of guidelines to help keep the arrangement viable. Many pitfalls are noted realistically, but the guidelines are designed to minimize these, including pre-divorce counseling. This position says that the visitation plan can be maintained and that not working at it is a rationalization. Although the age of the child is considered significant as a variable, broadly speaking this position tends to assume that a continuing relationship of the dependent child and the non-custodial father is good for the child. (There is the separate question,

of course, of its value for the parents, especially the father who may be seen to have "rights" to contact his children.) Perhaps the majority of custodial mothers tend to support this position since they seem to want at least some visitation to continue.

Another point of view might argue to "accept" the gradual loss of contact of the child with the father as a "natural" development which is really in the best interests of the youngster. This conceptualization seems implicit in some of the literature, particularly when remarriage establishes a "complete" home for the child once again. The non-custodial father's visitation may be abrasive to the new family unit where the child gains his basic security. Visiting and child support battles may be a continuation of the trauma of divorce for the dependent child. Is the father who "fades away" doing the child a favor? Even when there is no remarriage, it is pointed out in the literature that the parents become more and more different in their way of life so the child's development may be disrupted by continuing exposure to "two worlds" and their conflicting value systems.

The present state of knowledge appears to leave us with a series of significant questions concerning the welfare of the dependent child whose parents divorce; yet, Oregon law gives highest priority to the child's best interests as the third party to a divorce. The broadest question is whether we should accept or even facilitate the gradual diminution of the non-custodial father's visitation in a substantial number of cases? Or, should we find ways to reverse this common pattern of decreased mutual emotional investment between the child and his absentee parent? How is this broad question influenced by the child's age, sex, individual characteristics and

remarriage? The review of the literature makes it clear how little is known and how much is assumed--particularly in terms of the law's basic concern for the welfare of the dependent child.

II. SAMPLING FEASIBILITY STUDIES

Perhaps the most difficult problem in depth interviewing a group of divorced parents of minor children is to insure the representativeness of the sample. This means that both the original pool of S's and those who are finally interviewed are representative of the total population of divorced parents in a given community. Bias can enter from the start or be introduced by any systematic attrition in the form of S's who cannot be located or S's who refuse to be interviewed.

In this section, the research team has compared certain methods of obtaining the original pool of S's; the ease with which these divorced parents with minor children can be traced; and their degree of cooperation when they are asked to agree to be interviewed. Special attention has been given to the period of elapsed time since the granting of the divorce since this would have a bearing on the feasibility of a cross-sectional rather than longitudinal study. With this in mind, a sample of S's divorced in 1969 was contrasted with a 1965 divorce sample. Furthermore, the total project has been divided into two separate studies which highlight differences between an urban and a more rural community. The first study was conducted in metropolitan Portland and the second in Benton County.

A. Metropolitan Portland Study

The Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA) of Portland, Oregon, had a population of 999,500 as of July 1, 1969. This area includes Multnomah, Washington, and Clackamas Counties in Oregon and Clark County in Washington. More than half of this population lives in Multnomah County where 4,950 petitions were filed and 3,706 divorces were granted in 1969. The Portland SMSA had 13% per capita income above the national average (1962), with more households in the middle ranges and fewer in the lower. Approximately 400,000 people were employed in the Portland SMSA (1966). Industry is highly diversified (comparable to Chicago in variety) and evenly distributed in food, lumber, electronic, transportation, and paper products. The typical resident is three years older than the 29.5 median age in the United States as a whole (1960). The foreign-born residents in the Portland SMSA are present at a rate approximately equal to the national average of 5.5%, while there is only a small (3%) non-white population (Sauvie, 1969).

1) First Approaches to Divorced Parents.

Early experiences in contacting divorced S's led to awareness of the biases and inefficiency of several approaches; however, some of these disadvantages might be assets at a later time, e.g. permitting the study of a special sub-sample or facilitating group discussion not possible with S's traced as individuals. An example of this was the research team's experience with a social group of divorced men and women, Servetus Club. This club appeared to be predominantly middle-class and exclusively white. Only three essays about visitation were obtained from 18 club members who were willing to take essay

outlines in a sub-group meeting when the investigators explored some of the parameters of visitation in the earliest stages of this study.

(See Appendix C.) In contrast to this middle-class social club, divorced mothers supported by Multnomah County Welfare represent another special sample that was considered. Because of regulations pertaining to confidentiality, it was found that interviewing ADC mothers would have to come through special means, such as the ADC mothers discussion groups or activist organizations. Another early sampling approach, rejected because of its time-consuming inefficiency alone, was that of going directly to the voluminous Divorce Decree Files of the Multnomah County Courthouse. This approach requires plodding through thick files only to find that there were no minor children as third parties to the case!

2) Two Feasible Sources for a Metropolitan Portland Sample.

As far as the metropolitan Portland area is concerned, two main sources for a representative sample of divorced parents were examined in depth. Each has its particular bias as a basis for selecting S's. First of all, there are the records of the State of Oregon Bureau of Vital Statistics (VS sample) which give the names, age, birthplace, race, occupation, plaintiff, date of marriage, number of marriages, and grounds for divorce. Further, the record includes the number of minor children involved at the time of divorce. This is a complete unbiased listing of all divorces: alphabetically, by county, and by year. All of this material is recorded on microfilm since 1949 on forms like the one shown in Appendix D. The key problem here is that the address and name listed is accurate at the time of divorce. If

a sample is not from the current year, it is possible that a selective bias is introduced in the field operations. This is because: a) S's with the least mobility may represent a more socially stable, affluent sub-sample; b) S's more easily traced would not have name changes (remarried women) and again represent a special sub-sample since approximately 50% of divorced individuals are often remarried within three years.

Multnomah County maintains a Support Card File (SC sample) which contains approximately 11,000 cases or 22,000 names and addresses involved in the payment of child support. (A sample Support Card is found in Appendix D.) As of two years ago, a bill was passed to handle all child support payments through this SC system; however, the law has not been consistently enforced so the file is not a complete pool of S's.* There are many biases: a) private arrangements for payment worked out; b) no support payments provided for; c) father has custody; d) payments made weekly mean a low-income card may be continuously "pulled"; e) ADC mothers may have an address as Multnomah County Welfare and no other address can be obtained; f) foster parent addresses may be included rather than divorcing parents. Even if these disadvantages were not present, an SC sample would be collected under the handicap of an extremely active clerical system in a large county where hundreds of cards are being worked on at any one time. This problem was well documented when three attempts to cross-check 26 VS names confirmed only three cases in SC files. With all

*In Benton County, it was found that two-thirds of 1969 divorces with minor children were listed in the SC files. See Table 7.

these disadvantages, it should be pointed out that the SC approach has the virtue of providing names and addresses that are current.

3) Comparison of the Vital Statistics and Support Card Sampling Methods.

A total of 416 names were drawn as randomly as possible from the VS and SC pools for divorces granted in 1969 and 1965. For an S to be selected, he would be one of the first whose address was in the metropolitan Portland area (city, suburbs, and satellite towns), at least one of the pair of divorced parents had this address; the other address might be "unknown" but not an address so distant that it would be impractical to attempt an interview. Within these guidelines, the particular S's selected were the first available through clerical convenience. Telephone directories for the corresponding communities were then searched in an attempt to verify the names and addresses. Of course, this introduced the bias of a listed telephone number which has several sources of error: a) low income S's may not have a phone; b) "harrassed" S's may have unlisted numbers; c) name changes from remarriage may not be detected. With all these handicaps, approximately one quarter of S's selected by VS and SC sampling methods had verifiable telephone numbers. Table 1 shows that the findings were almost identical in comparing the attrition of S's from the two pools at this point.

Table 1

Verifiability of Phone Numbers According to Sample Pool

	Verified	Not Verified	Total
Vital Statistics	50	148	198
Support Card	51	167	218
	101	315	416

Once the verified telephone numbers of the VS and SC individuals were obtained, the research team was in the position to determine how cooperative S's would be in agreeing to be interviewed. Telephone calls to S's were made according to the standard format shown in Appendix E. Approximately four to six call backs were made in a period of one to two weeks before an S was considered unreachable by phone. Table 2 shows the degree of cooperation that was found in the VS and SC sample groups. Almost identical results were produced. Approximately one-third of S's were never reached or refused to be interviewed. Difficulty in actually reaching them by phone was the biggest reason the "cooperative" category was not larger. The total of 34 S's who agreed to be interviewed, however, represents only about one-twelfth of the original pool of S's drawn from the two record sources.

Table 2

Cooperation of Subjects with Verified Phone Numbers
According to Sample Pool

	Cooperative	Other	Total
Vital Statistics Pool	18	32	50
Support Card Pool	16	35	51
	34	67	101

4) Comparison of the 1969 and 1965 Divorce Samples.

An important question, in terms of planning future steps in this research project is the availability and cooperation of S's who have been divorced for several years compared to those where the decree has just been issued. This has a crucial bearing on whether a cross-

sectional study is possible. The two issues, availability and degree of cooperation, are summarized in Tables 3 and 4 respectively. It was determined that 1969 divorced S's were more potentially available through phone listings than 1965 S's, but not significantly so (chi square 1.10, 1 df). Of course, this does not mean that the 1965 S's who had verified phone listings were equally representative. This might be more geographically stable and be less likely to be remarried.

Table 3

Verifiability of Phone Numbers According to Year of Divorce

	Verified	Not Verified	Total
1969	58	162	220
1965	43	153	196
	101	315	416

Degree of cooperation was significantly different at the .03 level of confidence for S's who were granted divorces in 1969 compared to those divorced for a longer period (chi square 5.44, 1 df). This finding, for the combined metropolitan Portland VS and SC samples, is even more definite when the "Other" category is inspected in detail. Most of the 1969 S's who did not qualify as "Cooperative" were unavailable despite several call backs. Only 7 of the 58 S's divorced in 1969 made clear-cut refusals to be interviewed. More of the 1965 S's claimed there was an error (despite name and address matching) or made clear-cut refusals than was the case for 1969 divorces. These findings definitely suggest that there is considerably greater promise for interviewing recently divorced S's.

Table 4

Cooperation of S's with Verified Phone Numbers
According to Year of Divorce

	Cooperative	Other	Total
1969	25	33	58
1965	9	34	43
	34	67	101

5) Willingness to be Interviewed in terms of Sex of Interviewer and Respondent.

It was possible to study the VS and SC sample in terms of the rate of cooperation for S's with verified phone numbers in terms of the sex of the interviewer and whether the S was a divorced mother or father. Table 5 shows that of the 101 divorced parents with verified phone numbers (combined VS and SC sample), 64 were contacted by male interviewers on the research team and 37 were contacted by female interviewers. The distribution of respondents agreeing to be interviewed versus those who said no, could not be reached or claimed "error" was proportionately divided among the interviewers with no significant difference. Actually, when just the cooperative versus rejection figures are examined, eliminating S's who could not be reached or claimed error, both men and women interviewers enjoyed at 2 to 1 success ratio: female interviewers, 14 "yes" and 6 "no"; male interviewers, 20 "yes" and 11 "no."

Table 5

Success in Eliciting Cooperation
in Terms of Sex of Phone Interviewer

	Cooperative	Other	Total
Female Interviewer	14	23	37
Male Interviewer	20	44	64
	34	67	101

When we take a look at the research team's success in reaching and securing an agreement to be interviewed from divorced mothers compared to divorced fathers, we find more cooperative mothers but no significant difference. This data was tabulated for the VS sample only (N = 50), where 26 divorced mothers and 24 divorced fathers had verified telephone numbers. As Table 6 suggests, there is no sound basis to claim that fathers are less cooperative with interview research than the divorced mothers; in fact, only two fathers gave clear-cut rejections to the request to be interviewed. Most of the research team's failure here with fathers was in their unavailability when the residence phone was relied upon exclusively.

Table 6

Success in Eliciting Cooperation
in Terms of the Sex of the Respondent

	Cooperative	Other	Total
Mother	11	15	26
Father	7	17	24
	18	32	50

6) Supplementary Techniques in Tracing Sample S's.

Two supplementary techniques were briefly explored to determine what they would add to a search of telephone directories in locating S's. The first was the Portland city directory which is published once a year and is limited to the city proper. A sample of 55 names which were not available in the telephone directories were checked through the city directory and yielded an additional 6 verified S's. This source, therefore, can be expected to add relatively little to the telephone directory procedure.

Another attempt to elicit cooperation from S's, where no verified phone number could be established, was through the use of the mail. A sample of 40 such "no phone" S's with allegedly accurate addresses from the SC files were sent a letter (See Appendix D) with a self-addressed post card enclosed. These 40 S's were comprised of 20 pairs of ex-mates both with addresses in the Portland metropolitan area. With one mailing and a two-week time lapse, only 5 favorable responses were obtained. While this is not very encouraging, it does show that some of the "no phone" S's can be reached for interviews to determine if they represent a special sub-group.

B. Benton County Study

Benton County is located 80 miles southwest of Portland and has an area of approximately 675 square miles with a 1969 population of just 51,000. The area is predominantly rural with no urban center comparable to Portland; however, 31,000 of the county's inhabitants live within the city limits of Corvallis. This is the county seat and the home of Oregon State University. This is a major university which gives the county

somewhat of a "town-gown" culture common in small college towns throughout the nation. The community next in size to Corvallis has a population of only 1650. All of the other six or seven communities in the county number below 400. The area is at least half timberland.

There are few full-time farms and almost no heavy industry. Several plywood mills have been introduced in the county but their operation is often sporadic and sensitive to market fluctuations. There are a number of specialized services which hire professionals and skilled craftsmen, in addition to the university: an engineering firm, specialized sawmill machinery firm, and research organizations.

1) Method of Verifying Addresses and Telephones of Divorced Parents.

The method of selecting S's for study in Benton County was different from the metropolitan Portland sample procedure because of small numbers involved and the relatively simple clerical system related to this fact. In 1965 there were only 68 divorces with minor children (of a total of 103), and in 1969 there were 92 divorces with minor children as third parties (of a total 161 divorces granted). Of unknown significance, but in contrast to the national trend, the number of children involved declined from 2.4 to 2.05 per divorcing couple. The ratio of divorces per thousand population increased, however, from 2.48 in 1965 to 3.16 in 1969. By 1969 the 161 divorces granted represented slightly more than one divorce for every three marriage licenses issued (608). Because of data of this order, it was possible to examine the entire divorce population for both 1965 and 1969 rather than relying on sampling.

Copies of VS forms on divorces, beginning with 1964, are retained in their original form in the files of the Benton County Clerk's Office. Microfilm copies are also available in the Bureau of Vital Statistics in Portland. Also available in Benton County are files maintained by the Clerk's office for all support payments in divorce decrees for which the County Clerk serves as an intermediary in collection of payment. Also available in the Clerk's office are divorce files which include a copy of the divorce decree as well as property settlements and other pertinent documents relating to the divorce procedure. (Ralph Schindler, Benton County Clerk, indicated that all the above mentioned files are a matter of public record and are open to inspection without a judicial order.)

All of the 92 divorces in 1969 involving minor children and the 68 divorces in 1965 involving minor children were studied to obtain names and addresses from the VS records.* Then the VS data were cross-checked in the SC records. (This procedure proved non-feasible in Multnomah County.) Table 7 shows the utilization of the SC system with its presumably up-to-date data, i.e. change of names, if any, and current address. Half of the 1965 and almost two-thirds of the 1969 divorces were represented in the SC records.

Table 7

Utilization of Support Card Files
for 1965 and 1969 Divorces with Minor Children

	SC Used	SC Not Used	Total
1969	59	33	92
1965	34	34	68
	93	67	160

*Fathers averaged 33.33 years of age at time of divorce in 1969; 34.35 years, 1965. Mothers averaged 31.10 years of age at time of divorce in 1969; 31.30 years, 1965. The more recently divorced parents of minor children averaged 10.15 years of marriage ($s = 6.47$) for 1969 but data were incomplete for 1965.

Taking a more detailed look at the SC utilization to detect what factors or bias might enter, a range of circumstances were uncovered. In the 1965 sample, 5 of the 34 cases not using the SC system showed correspondence from the District Attorney which got no reply to his offer of aiding collection of support. One other case involved a death and another the marriage of the minor child in question. Two cases proved to be instances where the father had custody. (Remaining cases could not be researched due to temporary storage conditions.) From the one-third of 1969 cases not utilizing the SC system (33 non-use cases), a sample of 8 cases was randomly selected. In all instances the absence from the SC file resulted from: a) no support order issued; b) father custody.

2) Verifiability of Phone Numbers.

All names, with or without current addresses in the SC files, were searched out in the newly-issued Corvallis telephone directory, in other Benton County directories, and in communities in adjoining Linn County for a radius of 35 miles. (One name was dropped from the total 1965 S's because of a remarriage to the same partner and another case where there was the complication of the researcher being the marriage counselor for a subsequent marriage.) When a local telephone was not listed for a woman, a check was made to determine whether there was a listing under her maiden name at the address obtained from the SC file. If these corresponded, it was counted as a verified phone number. Table 8 displays the verifiability of phone numbers for parents divorced in 1965 and 1969. The more recent divorces yielded verifiable telephone listings at a significantly greater rate (.01 confidence level for chi square 8.43, 1 df).

Table 8

Verifiability of Phone Numbers According to Year of Divorce

	Verified	Not Verified	Total
1969	52	128	180
1965	20	114	134
	72	242	314

After obtaining telephone numbers that were verified, all of them were called using the same procedure as in the Metropolitan Portland Study (Appendix D Guidelines for Telephoning Subjects). The rate of cooperation, however, can not be strictly compared in the two studies because there was just one telephone interviewer in the Benton County Study. This ruled out the possibility of as many as six call backs and limited this to two; moreover, all calls were made by a female interviewer allowing no chance to confirm the Portland findings that sex of caller was not significant for eliciting cooperation. Nevertheless, some comparison with the Metropolitan Portland Study is possible, within these limitations, when we consider the degree of cooperation that was elicited by telephoning S's.

3) Cooperation of S's with Verifiable Phone Numbers Compared by Year of Divorce.

Exactly half of the 72 S's with verifiable phone numbers--potentially available--were reached and cooperative. This 50% ratio was quite high compared to the metropolitan Portland sample when it is considered that only two call backs were made in Benton County. The cooperative S's were evenly divided between the 1969 and 1965

samples (27/52 and 9/20 respectively); however, this was largely a matter of the difficulty in actually reaching 1965 S's, especially 1965 fathers. When S's not reached are dropped and a dichotomy of "cooperative" versus "refused" is created, only 18% of S's are uncooperative. The 1969 sample approaches significantly greater cooperation as shown in Table 9. Since the "expected" number of S's in some cells falls below the minimum required for the chi square test, the less robust 2 x 2 contingency test is appropriate (Finney, Latscha, Bennett and Hsu, 1963). Despite the fact that the telephone interviewers "yes" rate was almost 7 to 1 for 1969 divorced parents, this does not quite reach significance when compared to 1965.

Table 9

"Cooperative" versus "Refused" S's for 1969 and 1965 Divorces

	Cooperative	Refused	Total
1969	27	4	31
1965	9	4	13
	36	8	44

4) Cooperation of S's with Verifiable Phone Numbers and/or Addresses.

In addition to S's with phone numbers cross-checked with addresses, a number of divorced parents had addresses in the SC files for whom no telephone listing could be found. For 1969, 29 current addresses without phones were recorded; for 1965, 14. The 1969 parents in this category were evenly divided between fathers and mothers but the 1965 sample parents with addresses and not phones were mainly mothers (10:4). All of the S's with up-to-date addresses and no

phones were sent the same letter utilized in the Metropolitan Portland Study (Appendix D). Of the 29 S's in this category from 1969, 6 returned enclosed post cards and 5 of them were cooperative. Approximately one-fifth of the recently divorced S's without phones were cooperative, therefore, with just one mailing. The 1965 "no phone" group was less promising. Only 3 of 14 cards were returned, and two-thirds said "no." By combining cooperative responses elicited by telephone and mailing, a total of 32 S's gave permission for an interview of the total pool of 180 S's divorced in Benton County in 1969 who came under study. Therefore, almost 18% of the parents divorced in 1969 who had minor children gave permission of an interview about visitation with this modest effort to reach them.

5) Occupation of S's with Phones and Without Phones.

Ever since Landon was "elected" President of the United States (1936)* researchers have been keenly aware of the hazards of selecting a sample of S's by telephone listings. This caution appears to be justified in Benton County even in 1969. It was possible to review the occupations listed on VS forms for 42 fathers obtaining divorces in 1969 and to compare the 25 with verified telephone listings with the 17 for whom no phone was listed but there was a verified local address. The telephone listing group included 8 college professors; 3 engineers; 4 managers (office, bank, post office, grocery); 3 skilled workers (machinist, mechanic, carpenter); 2 retail salesmen; 4 semi-skilled or unskilled mill and construction workers; and one college student. This indeed is a high level sample in terms of occupational status, even with the understanding that the largest city in Benton County is a university town. By contrast, there was not a single university professor among the 17 verified addresses, although there was one scientist.

*Classical opinion polling error by the Literary Digest of depending on telephone listings to select a representative sample.

There were no managers or engineers, although there was an "engineer aide." The largest group here (6) consisted of loggers and millworkers. The remainder was sprinkled with skilled and semi-skilled workers (carpenter, electrician, heavy equipment operator); two sales clerks (grocery, shoes); there was a "glass worker" and an unemployed man (mental patient). Furthermore, four of these "no phone" men returned post cards when contacted by mail and included a telephone number in the correspondence (although none had been listed in the directory). All four of these divorced fathers appeared to be above the median for this "address" sample: scientist, engineering aide, electrician, and heavy equipment operator.

6) Availability and Cooperation of Divorced Fathers versus Mothers.

By combining verified telephone listings and up-to-date addresses, a total pool of 115 parents was created for the 1969 and 1965 samples who were potentially available for a visitation interview. The total constructed this way was almost identically divided, 58 mothers and 57 fathers. The total N here is disproportionately represented, however, by the 1969 sample where a full 45% of S's could be identified this way. Overall, more mothers cooperated with the request for an interview since 41% were reached and said "yes" while 32% of the fathers were reached and said "yes." Actually the degree of cooperation is obscured by the large numbers of both fathers and mothers who could not be reached. This clouds the possible difference in cooperation in terms of sex of respondent, especially when the response to mailing is blended in. For telephone response only, the mothers were significantly more cooperative at

the .02 level of confidence (chi square 5.52, 1 df). These data displayed in Table 10, however, may have the bias that the mother was home more frequently when telephoned at the residence.

Table 10
Cooperation of S's with Verified Phone Numbers
in Terms of Sex of Respondent

	Cooperative	Other	Total
Mothers	22	12	34
Fathers	14	24	38
	36	36	72

7) Mobility of Parents Divorced in 1965.

To assess the mobility of divorced parents with minor children, an examination was made of the 1965 sample of 34 cases which continued to be listed in the SC files. These 34 cases represent 50% of the total number of divorces in 1965 where children under 18 were third parties. These same 34 cases represent 68 S's with an address listed in the VS data at the time of divorce. By comparing the two addresses, some index of the mobility was achieved. The results show that of the 68 individuals in question, a full 50% had remained in the same town during the four to five years since the divorce. Twenty S's had moved but remained within the state; 8 left the state; 4 could not be accounted for. In 8 instances, both members of the divorced couple (16/88 or 25%) had remained in the same town during this period. It is interesting to note that the occupations of the fathers in these instances were unskilled (6) or unknown (2). This sample may suggest the opposite of what is often assumed in an urban setting, i. e. that socially stable,

more-easily contacted S's are affluent and enjoy high status.

C. Broad Conclusions from the Metropolitan Portland and Benton County Studies.

Although the sampling of S's in the urban and more rural population studies was similar, it was not precisely comparable because of differences in technique growing out of the situational factors. Nonetheless, some comparison is possible between the two studies, particularly where similar trends were observed despite differences in populations and specific techniques. The pattern of findings appears to be coherent in that a trend in one study often reached significance in the other, or visé versa. Perhaps the broadest conclusions that can be drawn are: a) bias in sampling as severely aggravated the post-divorce lapse of several years compared to a sample of recently divorced parents of minor children; b) parents are highly cooperative with a request to be interviewed about visitation when they are reached on the telephone.

1) Verifiability of Phone Listings.

Both studies found that approximately one-quarter of an original pool of subjects drawn from VS and SC sources were potentially available through a verifiable telephone listing. In Benton County the 1969 S's had significantly more verifiable phone listing than parents divorced in 1965; this was a trend in the Metropolitan Portland Study.

2) Cooperation of Parents with Verified Phone Listings.

About one-third of the Metropolitan Portland Study sample and one-half of the Benton County Study sample with verifiable phone listings were actually reached and gave permission for an interview. There may

be a suggestion that the Benton County S's were more cooperative since the higher rate is based on only two call backs compared to up to six in Portland. Actually, S's who were reached tended to be cooperative with a ratio of about 2 to 1 in metropolitan Portland and almost 4 to 1 in Benton County. A survey of occupations given for S's with and without phones raises a serious question about socioeconomic bias from source.

3) Cooperation of Parents Divorced in 1969 versus 1965.

It was possible to elicit the agreement to be interviewed from a significantly greater number of recently divorced parents in metropolitan Portland and this is a strong trend in Benton County, especially when the "not reached" are eliminated. The Benton County Study shows an overall "yes" rate of 72% and of 7 to 1 when just the 1969 S's are dichotomized. A full 18% of all parents divorced in Benton County in 1969, who had minor children, agreed to be interviewed about visitation when a modest effort of two telephone calls and one mailing was used in reaching them.

4) Cooperation of Mothers Versus Fathers.

In both the Metropolitan Portland Study and the Benton County Study there was a somewhat higher incidence of cooperation from mothers than from fathers. This reached significance in Benton County when the telephone approach was used, perhaps because of the unavailability of fathers at a residence telephone compared to mothers. The fact is that few fathers gave a direct "no" and the problem was one more of reaching them. When mothers did refuse to be interviewed, they were more likely to say that it would be "painful" whereas fathers claimed they were "too busy."

5) Mailings.

Attempting to elicit cooperation by a single mailing is inadequate compared to direct telephone contact; however, up to 20% of S's with no phones were willing to be interviewed after this approach by letter. This is probably important if for no other reason to determine whether the characteristics of "no phone" S's are different. The combination with telephone approach first has some promise.

6) Sex of Telephone Interviewer.

No sex differences were found between male and female research team members in their success in eliciting cooperation from S's by means of telephone interview. It was not possible to compare Benton County with the Metropolitan Portland Study because the former had a single interviewer, a woman who enjoyed considerable success in her contact. These results can not be generalized to questions about face-to-face depth interviews.

7) Mobility.

It was possible to examine the mobility of half of the Benton County parents of minor children from the 1965 sample. Half of these people were still in the same town and three-quarters remained in the state during the several years since the divorce. There was some hint that extreme lack of mobility was associated with unskilled occupations of the fathers.

III. SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS

A. Development of a Semi-Structured Interview of Divorced Parents.

Prior to approaching S's from the Portland Metropolitan or Benton County Study lists of names, the research team gained experience by approaching divorced parents with whom they were acquainted. Each interviewer contacted two "non-random" S's in order to have a "trial run" and become sensitized to significant material, points of resistance, and skill in coping with obstacles. The group attempted to "get the feel" of the interview in order to frame questions more effectively. In addition to this type of "informal" interview experience, some discussion was carried out with members of the Servetus Club. (See Section II, A-1) Actually the outline utilized in the semi-structured interviews (Appendix F) was an adaptation of one which served as a basis for collecting a few essays from club members.

The focus on the subsequent semi-structured interviews of 24 S's taken from Vital Statistics and Support Card records was to obtain "factual" content first and then shift to "feelings" and "recommendations." The first goal--besides getting some demographic information like age at the time of divorce, number of years married, ages of children, occupation, and the like--was to elicit a description of the visiting pattern and how it had evolved through time. Frequency of visits, variations from the regular pattern, duration and locations of visits, special occasions (birthdays, holidays, vacations) were all touched upon. There was an attempt also to get some factual material about the child support pattern in its relationship to visiting.

As the rapport of the interview developed, the research team member attempted to explore more subjective feelings about the past and present divorce picture and get at subjective wishes for the future. The interviewer tried to probe without unreasonably pushing into the most personal content where there were signals of resistance. Most S's, however, talked rather freely on most topics, especially those questions most directly related to visitation. Parents were frequently asked about their feelings in a way which made it possible to characterize them as positive, negative, ambivalent or neutral in tone regarding visitation. S's thoughts and feelings about "meaningful" visitation were sought. They were often asked about their estimate of the children's feelings in regard to visitation and about the relationship with the ex-spouse: businesslike, friendly, indifferent, unfriendly or bitter. In some cases the effects of other significant people in the situation (such as new mates, in-laws, grandparents or other children) were determined. Finally, the interviewers tried to elicit the divorced parent's perception of the court in its role and how the court might be of greater help in promoting a satisfying visitation arrangement. Recommendations to the court were encouraged. Overall, the interviewer tried to support the parent's discussion of general ideas and feelings as these arose and did not take a highly directive or "scheduled" approach. The interviews were more in the form of a free-flowing interchange and by no means limited to specific questions.

B. Characteristics of the Divorced Parents who were Interviewed.

A total of 24 divorced parents* were interviewed, by means of the semi-structured guideline appearing in Appendix E, evenly divided among

*See Appendix E for the interview summaries of cases numbered 1 to 24.

the six interviewers. The sample was selected from S's with verified telephone listings as described in the Metropolitan Portland and Benton County Studies (See Section II). These S's were, of course, originally taken from Vital Statistics and Support Card rolls. An attempt was made to make an appointment with the first S's actually reached on the phone, 20 from Portland and 4 from Benton County. There was also an effort to balance the number of 1965 and 1969 divorce cases to broaden the range of responses to the interview. It should be kept in mind that there was a systematic process of narrowing down from the total pools of 1965 and 1969 divorce populations to those with verified phones, to those who were reached by phone, to those who were willing to be interviewed. The original telephone contact followed the guidelines described previously and appended (Appendix D).

1) Age at Time of Divorce

Of the 24 parents, 15 mothers and 9 fathers, it was established that 13 of them were divorced in 1969 and 11 in 1965. In all but one instance (Case #6) the mother is the custodial parent. The mean ages of the S's at the time of divorce was older than expected, especially for the 1965 sample. The 1969 fathers and mothers were 32.5 and 34.1 years respectively at the time of divorce; the 1965 fathers and mothers were 36.0 and 44.3 years respectively. The Bureau of Vital Statistics reports a mean age of 34.7 for men and 30.9 for women at the time of divorce based on 1968 data. The Benton County Study found almost identical mean ages at time of divorce; for that area in 1969, the means were 34.3 for men and 31.3 for women. The S's actually interviewed by the semi-structured technique, therefore, appear to be a biased sample in respect to age--especially the sample of mothers.

While the 1969 mothers interviewed were perhaps two or three years older than expected, the 1965 sample of mothers interviewed were 10.2 years older still.

The implication of these data from this admittedly small sample is that there is a great hazard in biasing an attempt to get a representative sample of S's divorced several years previously, especially custodial mothers. Why would those custodial mothers, divorced four or five years, who agreed to be interviewed be older at the time of divorce than the expected baseline? Perhaps younger women with younger children were not reached as readily by telephone (name change or working) or perhaps they said "no" more frequently to the request for an interview. This is unknown. Whatever the reason, this finding concerning age is a serious danger signal highlighting a possible sample bias.

2) Remarriage

When the rate of remarriage is examined, it was found that 5 of 11 interviewed parents in the 1965 divorce sample married again while 7 of their ex-mates were remarried. These figures approximate the 50% to 75% rate which might be expected in this length of time according to national statistics. The 1969 group of interviewed S's included just 2 of 13 who had remarried. One ex-mate of these 13 had remarried. While approximately 25% of divorced people are expected to remarry in one year, a full year had not passed for many of these S's so again the rate is not far from broadly-based means.

3) Children

Excluding children 18 years of age or older at the time of divorce, a total of 41 youngsters were involved as third parties. These

children averaged 10.7 years of age at the time of their parents' divorce. The 19 children from the 1965 sample, like their parents, of course, were older than the 22 children from the 1969 sample; 12.5 and 9.4 years of age respectively at the time of the divorce. The fact that the children were older, as well as the fact that only 1.7 minor children were involved per divorce, gives rise to further caution in generalizing from these interviews. (The Benton County Study produced figures of 2.4 and 2.0 children under 18 for the 1965 and 1969 divorces in that county which involved minor children.)

4) Occupations

When employment is considered, business and professional positions are reported by 10 individuals (8 of 11 S's in the 1965 group); 6 are skilled white or blue-collar workers (2 from 1965); 3 are semi-skilled workers (1 from 1965); one is a full-time college student and 4 women are homemakers not gainfully employed. Only one of these 4 full-time homemakers is dependent on public welfare. Here again there is a strong suggestion of sample bias. Those S's actually interviewed reported occupational roles and general socioeconomic level considerably higher than expected, particularly the 1965 sample. Perhaps this fits with the Benton County Study's hint of phone listing bias (See Section II, B-5). On the other hand, this trend may be the commonly observed phenomenon of S's enhancing their status (Parry and Crossley, 1950).

C. Pattern of Visitation

When frequency of visitation is reviewed, there is a range from "none" (cases #12 and 17) to "almost nightly" (case #18). Five fathers visit "weekly" (cases #11, 13, 16, 21 and 22) and 4 of these 5 are from the recently-divorced sample (case #11 being the 1965 exception). Three

fathers visit approximately "every two weeks" (cases #3, 9 and 21). The others suggest a great variety and irregularity of times both from case to case and also within an individual case over time. Visiting often includes certain holidays and on or near birthdays. One factor appeared to emerge quite clearly when considering the pattern of visitation: children play an important role in controlling the visitation starting at about age 10. This sample of divorced parents very much took into account the child's wishes when it came to the visitation arrangement. In every instance where these 10-year olds had parents who viewed the "primary purpose" of visitation as a continuation of the child's relationship with the non-custodial parent, the parents mentioned that the children helped determine the times, duration and activities associated with the visits.

D. Primary Purpose of Visitation

When considering the purpose of visitation, what was considered "meaningful" by the S's in the majority of cases was the continuation of the relationship between the child and the non-custodial parent. The appended interview summaries reveal that all 11 of the 1965 divorced parents reported this general view. There were, however, some unusual variations. In cases #12 and #13, a continuation of fighting with the ex-spouse is judged to be the primary function of the visitation arrangement, little time or energy being spent by the visiting parent in relating to the children.

In one instance (case #21) the father is clearly hoping for a reconciliation. Despite family pressure on the young mother in this case, it appears that the couple is heading for another try at marriage. Another instance of the non-custodial father seeking reconciliation through frequent visiting is combined with the mother's use of it for

"free" babysitting, so she can get out of the house for recreational activities (case #18). The father resents this babysitting role but continues the pattern; the relationships within this family carry on almost like a divorce had not taken place. The couple's renegotiation of their relationship appears to be moving toward remarriage with the father sharing greater responsibility and the mother having more independence than was the case during the 12 years of their legal marriage.

Case #20 was special because of the severe, chronic mental disorder of the non-custodial father, who spends much of his time as a patient in the Oregon State Hospital. The visiting arrangement between this father and his teenage daughter, which occurs on holidays only, has a symbolic meaning to the family since the father's capacity to relate is so severely limited.

F. Feelings Between Divorced Parents and Recommendations to the Court.

As might be expected, there appears to be a substantial correlation between those divorced parents reporting bitterness and continued fighting with the ex-spouse and an expressed desire to have the court step in and make definite visitation arrangements, with the rights of each parent clearly spelled out. Four interviews seem to fall into this category (cases #9, 10, 13 and 22). In actuality, it is judged that these parents want more than a clear set of ground rules; they seem to want a "victory" where the court takes the "right side." This seems to be a way of "winning" in the continuing contest between the divorced partners which was not resolved by the decree.

In 3 of 4 cases where post-divorce counseling by the court was seen as desirable (cases #2, 5 and 6), the relationship with the ex-spouse

was described as "friendly" while in the other instance (case #14) the interviewer judged the relationship to have shifted from "friendly" to "ambivalent" because of the remarriage of the father. All 4 requests for counseling seemed to concern the welfare of the child rather than a request for personal, post-divorce adjustment guidance. The first 3 instances had a definite focus to the recommended counseling; help the non-custodial parent realize how much his visitation meant to the dependent child. As a correlary to that goal, the interviewed custodial parents wanted greater frequency of visiting and more initiative for the arrangement in the hands of the non-custodial parent (rather than just the child). In one example reported (case #2), the monthly visiting of the non-custodial father with his 10-year old son always comes about by the son's request and never spontaneously by the father. This allegedly is associated with an experience of rejection by the boy according to the mother's judgment, and she reports the teacher's concern about the youngster's lowered self-esteem. The one custodial father interviewed in this sample (case #14) felt that his 4-year old son deeply missed his mother who was described as "alcoholic" and even more rejecting of the boy because of the father's remarriage.

F. Parent Reports about the Feelings of Children Involved in Visitation.

Eleven of the 24 parents interviewed expressed satisfaction that their children had positive feelings about visitation. Six cases reported more "mixed" or "neutral" feelings, or were unable to ascribe a definite reaction such as in the case of infants. Five of these 6 cases were from the more recently divorced sample of S's. Nine of 11 parents interviewed from the 1965 sample had a "positive" impression of the children's reactions to visitation. Only one 1965 sample mother gave a very

negative picture of the visitation situation (case #10). The mother stated that she was forced to go to the District Attorney in order to insure support payments and that her ex-mate in turn uses visitation as a form of "harassment." This mother describes the feelings of her sons, ages 11 and 14, as ranging from "fear" to "apathy" when it comes to contacts with their father. She views the father's failure to pick up and return the boys on time as an example of his strategy of annoying her. This case is clearly an example of the failure to work out satisfying, meaningful visitation arrangements. The mother, frankly lacking in objectivity and candor, sees only that the court should lay down explicit rules about visitation rather than giving the "reasonable" guideline. The interviewer came away from this case with impressions that the continuing fight between the parents was probably the issue of concern to both of them with little genuine regard for the welfare of the child.

Considering the basically positive reports of the 1965 S's and the concentration of negative feedback in the more recently divorced parents, several interesting observations can be made as well as posing some basic questions. First, all 5 cases where ex-mates are characterized as "bitter" in their relationship (cases #12, 13, 15, 22 and 24) fail to see the child as having positive feelings about visitation. There may be an inability of such S's to perceive positive elements of visitation for the child but instead manifest a tendency to project their own negative feelings. Such a negative state of affairs may correlate with recency of divorce. The divorce experience itself, with its overtones of adversaries locked in combat, may well be a factor in the bitterness, possible lack of objectivity, and difficulty in placing the child's best interests at the center of concerns.

The parents who have been divorced a longer period of time may have gone through this stage, allowed the divorce trauma to fade, regained a more positive or objective perspective, and returned to a more effective parent role. Or was the 1965 sample of divorced S's different from the start? Let's not forget that they were older, had older children and an above-average socioeconomic level. One other point is that the recently-divorced parents with a "bitter" relationship had not participated in marriage or divorce counseling. None of them seemed to feel that counseling might be of value and there seemed to be a lack of awareness about the nature of the services available to them.

G. Tentative Conclusions

1. Serious doubt is cast upon the probability of interviewing a representative sample of S's who have been divorced for several years. This sample of parents divorced in 1965 was probably significantly older, had older children, and enjoyed higher socioeconomic status at the time of the divorce than baserates expected for the total divorce population or for recently divorced S's.
2. When actual contact is made for an interview, S's are generally cooperative and willing to give facts or express affectively-toned opinions about visitation.
3. Visiting patterns varied from none to almost every day; however, it was apparent in this sample of S's that the child of 10 plus played a major role in the frequency and activities of visitation.
4. There seemed to be a cluster of positive factors in visitation where: a) the relationship between divorced parents was "friendly" or at least "not bitter"; b) they were divorced longer; c) the primary purpose of visitation was seen as continuing the relationship between non-custodial parent and child.

5. A sub-group of cases existed where the relationship between the divorced parents per se was preeminent, either as an attempt to reconcile or as a grudge fight which allowed support-visitation issues to be the field of battle.

6. Recommendations to the court fell into two main categories: a) "spell out explicit rules and rights" regarding visitation (advice coming mainly from "bitter" parents locked in conflict); b) "provide counseling to promote more visitation" (advice of the custodial parents who were "child centered," especially mothers of sons).

7. The feelings of children involved in visitation were described by parents in such a way as to correlate with their own feelings so it was not known whether this was mainly "in the eye of the beholder" or that both sets of feelings varied in turn with other significant factors, such as the behavior of the non-custodial parent.

IV. CONCLUSIONS, PROBLEMS AND POSSIBILITIES

A. Sampling.

It is possible to start with a complete, unbiased population of divorced parents of minor children based on the data from the Bureau of Vital Statistics for any given year of divorce. Unfortunately, rapid attrition transforms this population into a highly biased sample of S's actually interviewed concerning visitation when telephone listings play a key role in reaching them. There is a dramatic, probably systematic, attrition of S's as each step is taken to reach them: verifying their telephone listings; contacting them by phone after repeated calls; eliciting cooperation with the request to be interviewed after contact is made.

In both the Metropolitan Portland Study and Benton County Study, only about a quarter of divorced parents had verifiable phone listings. The figures run only a little higher (26% and 28% respectively) when just the recent divorces are examined. This immediate, major loss of S's seems very high and probably reflects many factors which correlate with divorce, such as name changes, mobility, desire for anonymity, and economic stress. The Benton County data suggest that there is a socioeconomic bias in a phone listing sample even in relatively affluent times. Further sample loss takes place in making contact with the divorced parent on the phone despite the fact that he has a listing. Unavailability proved to be a bigger obstacle than actual refusal to be interviewed concerning visitation. It may not be assumed, however, that the high cooperation rate would continue if a truly representative sample of divorced parents were in fact reached.

Those 24 S's who were interviewed, moreover, appeared to be a biased sample which tended to be older and above average in social status. This was less so for the more recently divorced parents.

The inescapable conclusion from this sampling feasibility study is that the telephone listing technique of tracing S's is biased and that the sample is even less representative when an attempt is made to interview parents who have been divorced for several years. At the very least, the reliance on telephone listing needs to be dramatically supplemented and perhaps a radically different approach to sampling should be explored. A single mailing to verifiable addresses adds little to the phone listing approach although there are a significant number of such addresses which might be tapped some other way. Alternative approaches to sampling might concentrate more on channels through attorneys and the court. The San Bernadino Study (1960) showed that many attorneys are willing to cooperate with research. A slightly different tack would be to pick cases up right off the court's docket. With the permission of the judge and the attorneys, it might be possible to make contact with divorcing parents very early, in the procedure to insure a representative sample.

B. Visitation Patterns

Extreme caution must be exercised in any generalizations about visitation based on the 24 semi-structured interviews conducted in this study since the evidence points to marked sampling bias. Within this strong limitation, a few tentative generalizations about visitation are advanced here more in the form of hypotheses. First of all, "frequent" visitation appears to mean "once a week," when we are speaking of

recently divorced parents, and "twice a month" when we are speaking of those divorced for several years. About a quarter of non-custodial parents fall in this high frequency group. This compares to Goode's (1956) high frequency group. In some cases where visitation is very active, the child's interests are secondary to the relationship of the ex-mates and the web of child support, reconciliation efforts, and vindictiveness.

With the passage of time, the frequency of contact between non-custodial parent and child not only decreases but the general quality of the context may change. Parents may be less enmeshed in the ambivalence of the old marital relationship so that the purpose of visitation is more child centered. The most common reason for supporting visitation is the belief that continuing a relationship between the child and the absent father is of value. This may be in keeping with Goode's report that the majority of custodial mothers wanted visitation to continue. Some of the custodial parents interviewed in the present study wanted the court to provide counseling services which might promote visitation because it was seen as valuable to the child, without regard to the child support issue. This is also in agreement with Goode's Detroit research.

Many of the S's who were interviewed wanted the court to spell out the details of visitation and were definitely dissatisfied with the provision for "reasonable" arrangements. It was interviewers' impressions, however, that these requests for authoritative solutions to human relations problems came commonly from people who were still seeking some sort of "victory" in an old marital fight. Nevertheless, at least some cases seemed to be lost in the ambiguity of what was "reasonable" and had not worked this through with their attorneys.

An interesting finding, certainly worthy of considerable emphasis in future research, is the role of the child in controlling the frequency and quality of visitation. Most children seemed to be playing a significant role by about age 8 and all children of 10 and above played a significant role in the visitation arrangement. The role of the minor child may be viewed as a source of power and status, on the one hand, and aggravated dependency on the other. In other words, he might be "calling the tune" but in some instances he "had to ask" to see his father.

C. The Best Interests of the Child.

Ultimately the community's concern, spelled out in the law, is "the best interests of the child." This complex concept, taking into account both environmental and child adjustment factors, is seen by the Oregon Supreme Court as a total configuration (Tingen v. Tingen). It is exactly the kind of multi-dimensional situation that the Family Services Department social worker attempts to assess when he serves as a consultant to the Court. For the researcher, "the best interests of the child" must be the long-range target or the validity criterion for predictor variables. It is of great value to describe the varieties of visitation patterns and the decision making process which leads to parental consensus about an arrangement; however, it is even more significant to understand the impact of visitation on the child's development. Viewed in this manner, a problem of great scope is touched upon which goes far beyond our concern with visitation. It suggests the broad question of how researchers and practioners are going to describe and measure the quality of a given child's total welfare.

Perhaps the best we can do now is to face the fact that we often do not know what is in the child's best interests. At least we might avoid rigid advice and moralistic pronouncements. For instance, even the fact of divorce per se is a complex event which is mediated by other variables, such as religion and the mother-child age combination, when its impact on the child is considered (Rosenberg, 1965). Since the impact of divorce itself is embedded in a gestalt of variables, it seems reasonable to believe that visitation also will have an effect depending on its interaction with a few other important conditions. It would seem wise to be cautious about efforts to promote frequent visitation as a blanket policy. The evidence warrants modesty in our advice and alertness to implicit assumptions.

A hazard which may accompany legal reforms and increased counseling services is the tendency to act upon assumptions such as "visitation is good." The "Bill of Rights for Children" utilized by the Milwaukee Family Court appears to act upon this assumption. Grolman (1969) clearly articulates this idea which in turn is supported by a number of the parents interviewed in Goode's old Detroit study and the present one. On the other hand, there is the observation by Hunt (1966) that children are likely to be torn by increasingly divergent life styles of their parents. The fact is that fathers do fade away, perhaps at a rate which is not much different from the rapid drop off of fulfilling child support obligations (Eckhardt, 1968). Some reports (Goode, 1956; Landis, 1960) claim that remarriage of the custodial mother is in the child's best interests and that visitation of the non-custodial father can be as much a complication as a value to the child. In any event, there is room for controversy rather than confidence in assumptions about visitation.

D. Possible Next Steps.

It has been found that many divorced parents with minor children are willing to be interviewed about visitation arrangements. A next step might be that of using the proto-type interview schedule (Appendix G) to create a reliable instrument which can be administered in less than an hour. Dropping certain questions, refining others, and establishing reliable response scoring categories can be carried out in all probability even before all the problems of representative sampling are resolved. Some issues of reliability and validity of interview responses can be attacked without particular reference to representative sampling. For instance, S's responses for a number of factual items could be checked against the records of the Bureau of Vital Statistics and the complete file of the divorce proceedings, much as Parry and Crossley (1950) did with other material. The interview schedules should also give special emphasis to a section which tries to summarize the quality of the child's adjustment.

Since the findings of this feasibility study consistently point to an extreme bias in locating parents who have been divorced for several years, a longitudinal research strategy is suggested. Of course, it can lead to systematic bias over time because of the attrition of the original S's. A short-term longitudinal study seems indicated and well supported by evidence that there is a rapid process in the fading away of non-custodial fathers. If we use Eckhardt's (1968) data on full conformity to child support payment, it may be concluded that the biggest source of variance is the first year where 42% already show no conformity whatsoever. The 38% of fathers who fully conform to child support orders during the first year drops to 28% by the end of two years.

Another important event which takes place frequently in the first year or two is the remarriage of the divorced parents. It may be expected that approximately a quarter of these parents will be remarried in a year and up to half by three years. It would seem that this is a crucial event in understanding the visitation arrangement and the best interests of the child. This is especially interesting because of Rosenberg's (1965) study of adolescents' self-esteem and psychosomatic symptoms which contradicts the trend of the literature to picture remarriage, reconstituting a complete family unit, to be a positive force in the child's welfare. In some respects, such as economic security, this might not be questioned. Some of the basis, however, for believing that remarriage of the custodial mother is in the child's best interests stem from her reports. Rosenberg obtained his measures of self-esteem and psychophysiologic anxiety from adolescents whose parents had been divorced for varying time spans. His surprising finding was that lower self-esteem of the child was associated with remarriage of the parent. The older the child was at the time of remarriage, the more it seemed to correlate with damaged self-esteem. The most likely interpretation is that remarriage disrupts a close-knit family unit where the older child has enjoyed significant status and affectional intimacy with the custodial mother.

The rapid fall off of child support payment and the frequency of early remarriage give credence to a short-term longitudinal study of visitation arrangements. It gives more support for the idea of making very early contact with S's, possibly prior to the granting of divorce, by utilizing the court's docket. In this way, both the problem of obtaining a representative sample of divorced parents with minor children and

studying them very early might be accomplished. In as many instances as possible, the pair of ex-mates would be interviewed as a sub-sample. A measure of the child's adjustment could be taken prior to his parents' divorce, during the early visitation phase, and after remarriage (especially the custodial mother). To reduce the complexity of the design, it would probably be wise to study cases where the mother was the custodial parent. Even a one-year study should provide a number of cases where the divorce-remarriage sequence was completed so that it could be compared to those where varying patterns of visitation existed without remarriage. A serious complication is the desirability of having a fairly large N to be examined in this way in order to carry out a multivariate analysis which could cope with important mediating variables such as the age, sex, and socioeconomic status of the child and his family.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bell, N. W. and Vogel, E. F. The Family. Glencoe (Illinois): Free Press, 1962.
- Berlin, J. I. and Wyckoff, L. B. Improving Communication in Marriage. Atlanta, Georgia: Human Development Institute, Inc., 1964.
- Berne, E. Transactional Analysis in Psychotherapy. New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1961.
- Bettleheim, B. The Children of the Dream. The MacMillan Co., 1969.
- Buss, A. H. Psychopathology. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1966.
- Collins, R. L. Family Service Department Budget. Multnomah County, Fiscal Year 1970-71.
- Davis, K. "Children of Divorced Parents: A Sociological and Statistical Analysis," Law and Contemporary Problems. Summer, 1944.
- Depsert, Louise. "Children of Divorce," Dolphin Books. New York: Doubleday, 1962.
- Eckhardt, K. W. "Deviance, Visibility and Legal Action: The Duty to Support," Social Problems, XV, 1968, pp. 470-477.
- Family Services Department Budget, Multnomah County, Fiscal Year 1970-71.
- Farina, A. "Patterns of Role Dominance and Conflict in Parents of Schizophrenic Patients," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. 1960, 61, pp. 31-38.
- Ferreira, A. J. "Decision Making in Normal and Pathologic Families," Archives of General Psychiatry, VIII, 1963, pp. 68-73.
- Finney, D. F., Latascha, R., Bennett, B. M., and Hsu, P. Tables for Testing Significance in a 2 x 2 Contingency Tables. London: Cambridge University Press, 1962.
- Glueck S. and Glueck, E. T. Family Environment and Delinquency. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1962.
- Goode, W. J. After Divorce. Glencoe (Illinois): Free Press, 1956.
- Grollman, E. A. Explaining Divorce to Children. Boston: Beacon Press, 1969.

Haley, J. "Research on Family Patterns: An Instrument Measurement," Family Process, III, 1964, pp. 41-65.

Haley, J. Strategies of Psychotherapy. New York: Grune and Stratton, Inc., 1963.

Hanf, Constance. A Two-Stage Program for Modifying Maternal Behaviors during Mother-Child Interaction. Paper presented at the Western Psychological Association Meeting, Vancouver, B. C., 1969.

Hunt, M. M. The World of the Formerly Married. Greenwich (Conn.): Fawcett Publishing Inc., 1967.

Jackson, D. D. and Yalom, I. "Family Research on the Problem of Ulcerative Colitis," Archives of General Psychiatry, XV, 1966.

Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B., Martin, C. E., and Gebhard, P.H. Sexual Behavior in the Human Female. New York: W. B. Saunders, 1953.

Klebanoff, L. F. "Parental Attitudes of Mothers of Schizophrenic, Brain-Injured and Retarded and Normal Children," American Journal of Ortho-Psychiatry, XXIV, 1959, pp. 445-454.

Landis, J. T. "The Trauma of Children when Parents Divorce," Marriage and Family Living, XXII, February, 1960.

Leslie, G. R. The Family in Social Context. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.

Lewis, Judge Jean. Personal Communication(Interview), Portland, September, 1969.

Lidz, T. and Fleck, S. "Schizophrenia, Human Integration, and the Role of the Family," The Etiology of Schizophrenia, New York: Basic Books, 1960.

Locke, H. J. Predicting Adjustment in Marriage. New York: Henry Holt, 1951.

Masters, W. H. and Johnson, V. E. Human Sexual Inadequacy. New York: Little, Brown and Company, 1970.

Mengler, Judge Richard. Personal Communication(Interview), Corvallis, 1970.

Murstein, B. and Glaudin, V. "Use of the MMPI in the Determination of Marital Adjustment," Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXX, 1968, pp. 651-5 N.

Nimkoff, M. F. The Family. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1947.

- Paget and Kern. Counseling Services to Parents and Children Involved in Divorce Proceedings. San Bernadino, California, 1960.
- Parry, R. and Crossley, P. "Validity of Responses to Survey Questions," Public Opinion Quarterly, 1950, pp. 61-80.
- Patterson, C. R. Living with Children: New Methods for Parents and Teachers. Champaign (Illinois): Research Press, 1968.
- Perls, Fredrick. Gestalt Therapy. New York: Julian Press, 1969.
- Pond, D. A., Ryle, A. and Hamilton, M. "Marriage and Neurosis in a Working Class Population," The British Journal of Psychiatry, 109, 1963, pp. 602-6-05.
- Divorce and Children of Divorce. Portland City Club Bulletin, Portland, 1948.
- Rogers, C. R. Client Centered Therapy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1967.
- Rosenberg, M. Society and the Adolescent Self Image. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1965.
- Satir, Virginia. Conjoint Family Therapy. Palo Alto, California: Science and Behavior Books, Inc., 1964.
- Sauvie, C. L. Portland (Oregon) Market Its Consumers' Profile. Portland: Portland General Electric Co., 1969.
- Scholfield, W. and Balian, L. "A Comparative Study of the Personal Histories of Schizophrenic and Nonpsychiatric Patients," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LX, 1959.
- Simpson, G. People in Families. New York: Thomas Crowell Co., 1960.
- Steinzor, Bernard. When Parents Divorce: A New Approach to New Relations. New York: Pantheon Books, 1969.
- Stuart, R. B. Prostitution as a Treatment of Marital Disorder. Paper Presented at Second Annual Meeting of the Association for the Advancement of the Behavioral Therapies, San Francisco, 1968.
- Sussman, M. B. Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1965.
- Szasz, Thomas. The Myth of Mental Illness. New York: Harper, 1961.
- Tharp, R. G. "Psychological Patterning in Marriage," Psychological Bulletin, LX, 1963, pp. 97-117.
- Tyler, Leona. The Work of the Counselor. New York: Appleton Century Crofts, 1953.

(Bibliography Addendum)

Barfield, Richard and others. Early Retirement; the Decision and the Experience. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1969.

The Interviewer's Manual. Ann Arbor: Institute of Social Research, University of Michigan, 1969.

APPENDIX A

PERSPECTIVES ON DIVORCE AMERICAN STYLE

A. The Modern American Family Under Stress

The small, primary family unit is a basic institution in the United States which is expected to provide a broad range of personal-social satisfactions while preserving the basic societal norms. No other institution has been considered more important in terms of transmitting cultural values and nurturing the young. The family unit is also expected to be an enduring, mobile, flexible economic cog in the machinery of a highly industrialized civilization. In sum, much is expected of the family. The "success" or "failure" of the family is an issue of great concern both in terms of humanistic values and in preserving the fabric of the "American Way of Life."

It is all too common to think of the family's success or failure in dichotomous categories as soon as divorce is considered; yet, the many functions of the family provide a variety of dimensions to gauge success. A self-evident point is that the quality of living within a family--frequently reduced to some measure of reported "happiness"--may be "poor" without the actual physical separation of the group members. It is common, for instance, to claim that approximately one quarter of marriages end in divorce but that another quarter is significantly "unhappy." Even this kind of qualification of the "divorce dichotomy" is simplistic since the dimensions of physical health, economic security, "mental health," work productivity, creativity of the family unit is not adequately assessed, especially the long-range adjustments and achievements of the offspring. Some socially stable, even well-satisfied families,

may maintain the integrity of the group at some price of psychosomatic disease or "scapegoating" through the "mental illness" of one of the children (Jackson and Yalom, 1966; Lidz and Fleck, 1960). These generalizations are old hat, but it is necessary to remind ourselves of them to avoid too narrow consideration of the meaning of divorce per se.

When the magnitude of the problem of disturbed family living is considered, it is commonplace for it to stimulate an emotionalized reaction where positions are taken and pet solutions are advanced with great conviction. Each group with an axe to grind is likely to press for its "answer" varying from changing marriage and divorce laws (stricter, broader), to relying on family life education or mass mental health programs as well as seeking spiritual revivals. Others have given up on the small family unit completely in favor of the Israeli kibbutz (Bettleheim, 1969). The "hippie" movement, in many respects, may be considered as much a protest against the traditional family as it is a rebellion concerning the military-industrial complex. Some observers believe that the redefined "love" espoused by the "flower children" is a step toward a new extended family form in a commune. It may be that in a few years, researchers will look back and wonder why this study was concerned with post-divorce visitation and missed the fact that the entire concept of the family was being revolutionalized.

B. Grounds for Divorce.

In the United States there are as many sets of divorce laws as there are jurisdictions, including all the states plus the District of Columbia. All domestic relations laws, including divorce statutes, are

embodied in state legal codes. All states now sanction divorce. Until 1966, the state of New York granted divorce for adultery only; but since then, it has extended the grounds to include cruelty, abandonment, imprisonment, and after a two-year estrangement following a formal separation decree. At the other end of the spectrum, Kentucky grants divorce on twenty separate grounds. Nationwide, over 40 different legal grounds currently exist. Despite the variety of legal grounds, the overwhelming proportion of divorces are granted either on the grounds of cruelty or desertion (Leslie, 1967).

The meaning of the various grounds for divorce carries considerable latitude and opportunity for collusion. Some statutes pertaining to "cruelty," for instance, require "extreme physical cruelty" while other laws mean "mental distress." Generally, the courts tend to construe the term cruelty loosely so the term has wide usage as a relatively unobjectionable charge. Approximately one-third of the United States divorces are granted on the grounds of "desertion" despite the fact that the term is fictitious insofar as the partners may know the whereabouts of the other. "Adultery" runs a poor third as grounds for divorce (less than 2% nationally). Obviously many more marriages are adulterous so this legalistic fact can hardly be used as evidence to reassure conservatives that the "sexual revolution" is myth.

C. The Adversary System.

In the United States pursuant to the legal granting of a divorce decree, one spouse must bring charges against another in court which, if proven, constitute legal grounds for divorce in that state. Thus, a guilty party and an innocent party are established by the law, although it is recognized that this situation seldom, if ever, represents a realistic

picture of the marital relationship where the "innocent" party may in fact be highly provocative (Berne, 1961). Divorce on the basis of mutual consent exists nowhere in the United States, although four states (Alaska, California, New Mexico, and Oklahoma) do permit divorce on the grounds of "incompatibility" which may imply no moral fault on the part of either spouse.

As a practical matter, most people appear to seek divorce when living together seems less tolerable than living apart, by which time it is likely that both spouses have engaged in behavior which constitute legal grounds for divorce. So, in practice, legal requirements are often winked at. Usually both husband and wife agree to seek a divorce; their attorneys get together to work out the rationale and terms of the divorce settlement to present to the judge. The presiding judge may modify the recommended settlement, but approximately 85% of the United States divorces are default decrees: the defendant spouse simply fails to appear in court to contest the charges so he is assumed guilty by default (Leslie, *ibid.*).

For purposes of this paper, the significance of the adversary system is not the question of the propriety of the couple and their attorneys being engaged in a unique conspiracy to make a social accommodation to the law; it is instead that in spite of these efforts to be "reasonable" and minimize the injury to personal dignity, the whole process nonetheless tends to generate strife and bitterness. Although a couple may be in agreement that a divorce is necessary, the separating partners are usually sensitive, angry, and ashamed. The attorneys, in turn, are bound by professional ethics to obtain the best possible settlement for the client--the individual partner who

seeks out counsel (Leslie, *ibid.*)

Self-interested bargaining represented by counsel usually escalates the sensitivity and rage experienced by parting spouses. As painful negotiations about "who gets" the house, the car, insurance, tax benefits, and the like take place, bitterness may grow. Custody, support, and visitation arrangements concerning minor children usually takes place in this context of dividing the spoils. What may have started as negotiations for an equitable solution for both partners and the welfare of the children, often degenerates into a bitter, mutually attacking posture which may hamper cooperation on the continuing mutual responsibility of the welfare of the children. "Virtually all authorities in the field are agreed that much of the vindictiveness which has been traditionally associated with divorce in the United States is traceable to the hostilities that are engendered by the divorce process itself (Leslie, *ibid.*).

D. The Impact of Divorce Upon Children.

It has been estimated that approximately half a million more children per year are forced to cope with the fact that their parents are getting a divorce. Although the law clearly states that children's interests shall be given priority as third parties to divorce, the present adversary system, as briefly reviewed above, predisposes the child to conditions where his fate is determined more by compromise between conflicting parental demands, as arbitrated by attorneys, than it is by any objective, sophisticated consideration of the child per se. The judge, above all, attempts to represent the child's interests.

"Over the years, there has been even more public concern for the presumed effects of divorce upon the children involved than there

has been for the welfare of their parents. And the presumed effects upon the children have almost always been bad. Adults knowing something of the trauma of divorce for themselves and their peers, have generally assumed that children must suffer far more." (Leslie, *ibid.*, p. 617)

Empirical research, as usual, chastises us for assuming too much for the reactions of children to divorce may be distinctly variable. Some children are relieved when a divorce takes place and generally improve their adjustments. "The reactions of children to divorce depend greatly upon their previous evaluations of the parental marriages and their own security in their families. Over half the children from unhappy homes reacted by thinking that divorce was the best thing for all concerned." (Landis, 1960) Findings from this report go on to suggest, however, that children commonly suffered in feeling "used" after the divorce, experienced shame, felt inferior, relied on "denial" in pretending "nothing had happened."

Goode's (1956) interview study of divorced Detroit mothers concluded: "Apparently there is a foundation for the belief that children suffer trauma from divorce....." (p. 15). He classified the amount of "trauma" that the mother experienced at the time of divorce and correlated it with her report of the number of "problems" she had with the children subsequently. There was a proportionate relationship between the experienced trauma and the children's problem behavior. (Of course, this relationship could mainly be a perceptual constancy in the interviewed mother or perhaps a reflection of her inability to be an effective mother while so emotionally distressed.) Interestingly enough, Goode further concluded that following the trauma of divorce,

the vast majority of mothers believed that their children were "better off" than before the divorce. Again, the finding is highly interesting but raises the question of a biased report because of "justification."

There are many links between the history of divorce or unhappy parents and the maladjustment of the offspring. "Unhappy" parents seem to have children who grow up and complain of poor marriages (Locke, 1951). "Broken homes," combining dissolution from divorce and death, occur during the developmental years of nearly 40% of psychotic adults in contrast to a general population index of 12% (Buss, 1966). Many such findings, however, are purely correlational and may be confounded with such influences as socioeconomic level. A number of studies are not only postdictive in this correlation but are retrospective as well so that relationships may be artifacts of S's report. A predictive study such as the Gluecks' (1962) forecasting delinquent behavior is more convincing in tying family environment to disordered behavior. Another recent approach has been to measure the interaction process within "normal" families and those with a disordered child (Farina, 1960; Ferreria, 1963; Haley, 1964). Such comparisons of "arbitrary groups" can have confounded influences also as well as not representing identical observations, i.e. "normal" families are observed in the context of being volunteers rather than clinic families. A few other results also counsel us to be cautious: Klebanoff's (1959) work which shows that a child's characteristics may elicit selective parenting rather than just being shaped by parental behavior; Scholfield and Balian's (1959) data which show lower incidence of parental divorce in the developmental histories of schizophrenic patients than in general medical patients. Probably no one would challenge the truism that

family environment, including the relationship of the parents, has an important bearing on "the best interests of the child"; however, the relationship is not as simple or unidimensional as might first be expected. The factor of parental divorce per se may not, for instance, be destructive to those "best interests."

E. Contemporary Approaches to Problems of Divorce.

Sussman (1965) has critically outlined the relative merits of differing goals in society's attempt to meet the problems of divorce. He classifies the approaches in terms of: reducing the divorce rate; stabilizing the family; insuring the happiness of the family; emphasizing the happiness of the individual; providing an emotionally healthy home for the children. Some of the goals imply self-sacrifice while others represent humanistic individualism. Sussman brings out squarely that approaches to family problems are built on the shifting sands of value judgments: "...one spouse wishes to remain married, and will be unhappy if the marriage ends. The other spouse desires a divorce, and is unhappy while the marriage continues. One of the children sees the divorce as good riddance of one parent, while the other child feels rejected by both parents in divorce or marriage." (Ibid., p. 457) This kind of analysis logically leads to the question: Whose happiness? Whose values?

1) Legal Reform.

Legal reform as an approach to the problems of divorce usually takes the form of making it more difficult to marry or more difficult to secure a divorce. Probably more constructive is the attempt to have uniformity in our laws. Legal reforms which reduce the need to fix

moral guilt and to engage in collusion are also probably more useful than repressive measures against the backdrop of a "now" generation. Nimkoff (1947) has succinctly analyzed the relationship between the stringency of law and divorce rate, finding that a number of countries with more liberal laws have a lower divorce rate than the United States. His view is that strictness of divorce laws do have an effect on divorce rates within a given cultural setting, but that divorce rate is a "symptom" and that the strictness of laws either obscurs or emphasizes the symptom.

There are legal reforms, however, which are not simply a matter of a strict-liberal dimension. Here might include judicial practice as well as legislation. As Leslie (1967) has pointed out: "The more conscientious the judge, the more likely he is to see that in cases involving custody of children, he stands on the edge of a field of knowledge in which he is not at home." This leads many judges to utilize trained consultants of various persuasions to help interpret the child's complex and often conflicting needs. The age and sex of the child are interwoven with parental characteristics, the child's health and social adjustment, plus the physical-economic structure. The total configuration must be taken into account according to the Oregon Supreme Court (Tingen vs. Tingen, 1968). The judge's task thus becomes more complex but more in tune with the reality of the child's best interests. Judges seem to be willing to deal with these cases more in keeping with individual circumstances rather than falling back on a simplistic tradition, such as awarding custody to the mother almost automatically. Contemporary decisions are more in keeping with ORS. 107.100 which expressly states that the mother

shall not have preference in custody issues "for the sole reason she is the mother." (Lewis, 1969)

On a broader scale of reform, there is the movement to establish a "family court" system which brings all the problems growing out of family conflict into a single judicial department. Marital, custody, juvenile delinquency, and perhaps even cases of "mental illness" would be considered in an atmosphere of "therapeutic problem solving" rather than an adversary or trial procedure. Some urban centers come close to this approach by emphasis on family consultation and counseling. In Oregon, the more rural areas have nothing approaching this concept. Recent legislation and funding has attempted to improve the judicial system in these smaller communities, largely by expanding the scope and funding of the juvenile court. It is important to keep in mind, however, that a counseling-oriented "family court" must still make adequate provisions for protecting the civil rights of the parties involved rather than taking a completely paternalistic stance. Szasz (1961) for instance has made an iconoclastic attack on psychiatry and the courts in violating the civil rights of alleged mental patients. The recent "Galt Decision" of the United States Supreme Court also emphasizes that the civil rights of juveniles must be guaranteed.

The Milwaukee (Wisconsin) Family Court has been operating for several years and has been described in highly positive terms (Simpson, 1960). This court emphasizes a social work approach to resolving marital, custodial, and visitation problems. It underscores the continuing responsibilities of the parents which exist after a divorce is granted. Divorcing parents are required to comprehend a nine-point "Bill of Rights for Children." This formal document firmly

establishes the rights of the minor child as a third party to the divorce. Some of the specific principles in the Milwaukee Court's document seem to assume that continued contact with the non-custodial parent is "good" for the child's development without question. Point four reads: "The right to know the non-custodial parent and to have the benefit of that parent's love and guidance through adequate visitation."

Milwaukee's "Bill of Rights" is probably followed by many courts without such a formal statement. More important, it would seem, is the fact that Milwaukee's Family Court requires mandatory social services for all divorce actions involving minor children. Moreover, social work services are to be continued after the divorce is granted so that a review procedure is built in. The routine default decree, which provides minimal insurance that the best interests of the child are respected, is monitored by the Milwaukee system in this way where minor children are present. How this "experiment" works out should be significant in planning in other areas of the nation. One finding that is reported is that 48% of divorce actions are dropped in the Milwaukee Family Court compared to an alleged national average of 30% (Simpson, *ibid.*) Here in Multnomah County, the Family Services Department reports that 56% of the couples who participated in conciliation counseling did not go on to divorce according to a three-year study of cases, 1964-65-66. (Collins, 1970) These figures are not directly comparable in several respects in that Family Services Department sees a select group which probably represents the more conflicted, ambivalent couples, i.e. with some positive motivation but also the "toughest" cases.

2) Counseling and Psychotherapy.

Programs like the Milwaukee Family Court and the Multnomah County Family Services Department emphasize counseling and consultation. The community often places great faith in "marriage counseling" but frequently makes a judgment solely by the criterion of the number of marriages "saved." It is usually assumed, not without some reason, that the counselor's job is to intervene in a marital crises, effect conciliation, and keep the family together--often "for the sake of the children." Needless to say, there are some cases where the best interests of the child may be served by the separation of his parents and being removed from a chaotic emotional climate or even overt violence. Two important points grow out of this observation. First of all, counseling families during a period of crisis and significant suffering has prima facie validity in a humanistic value system, i.e. the attempt to reduce misery does not have to await "proof" from outcome studies nor is it completely dependent on the findings of a narrow outcome criterion. Counseling troubled families during a crisis must be responsive solely to the evidence which suggests a "better way" to, serve the clients. Broadly speaking, people who do participate in counseling tend to report a fairly high rate satisfaction (Tyler, 1969).

The second major point which grows out of the reality of disorganized family life is that "divorce counseling" must become legitimized just as "marriage counseling" is. Some of the most effective counseling takes place after the decision to divorce has been reached and there is a reduction of this component of the adversary tone. Divorce counseling can help reduce bitterness, ameliorate significant mental health crises, and contribute to improved human

relationships in the future, possibly including future marriages. Of course, divorce counseling is most easily justified where there are minor children in the family. This might be called "custody counseling" even when there is little doubt about the main custody agreement. There are still all the details of the agreement, as well as the degree of consensus or emotional acceptance, to be worked through. This, of course, includes the visitation arrangements, directly pertinent to the present study. Moreover, as reported above in section I-C, custody counseling has become increasingly important in the operation of the Family Services Department.

When the total field of counseling and psychotherapy is surveyed, there is a definite trend away from the classical psychoanalytic model toward the primacy of "family therapy" which utilizes more direct, social modes of intervention. There is considerable disenchantment with esoteric preoccupation with intrapsychic processes as the smoke of social revolution stings the counselor's eyes. Some of the psychoanalytic tradition has adapted successfully to marriage and family problems in the form of "transactional analysis" (Berne, 1961). While these approaches are still mindful of the individual's inner experience and his developmental history, the emphasis is placed on repetitive, destructive social patterns ("games"), often in the family context, which must be labeled and controlled. The framework is still psychoanalytic, but it is the relationship which is the locus of the "neurosis."

Many creative innovations to marriage and family counseling have been based on better understanding of the principles of small groups communications. Haley (1963) has written perhaps the most

cogent analysis of the communication paradoxes which exist within the marriage relationship. Satir (1964) and others have popularized the family therapy approach so that terms like "conjoint counseling" have become cliches. The communications model of marriage counseling has even been "programmed" so that couples can have homework assignments practicing communications skills to supplement a conjoint session with the counselor (Berlin and Wycoff, 1964).

Other developments in counseling and psychotherapy share some of the transactional analysis and communicational model characteristics but add further unique dimensions. Perhaps two contemporary emphasis are: a) "here and now" orientation rather than "then and there"; b) "action" techniques trying to break through the limitations of "talk therapies." The family is required to focus on the common experience they are sharing at the moment while close attention is paid to non-verbal communication such as eye contact and tone of voice. The counselor's style may be empathic-supportive (Rogers, 1967) or more confronting-psychodramatic (Perls, 1969). In any event, the counselor opposes historical accounts and motivational interpretations of other family members' behavior. He is more likely to try to get the family to join hands and talk about being close in the present than to analyze the historical reasons why they have not been close.

A third major trend in marriage counseling has grown out of "behavior modification" based on the principles of reinforcement learning theory. Behavioral counseling has been particularly effective when family problems are manifested through the deviate behavior of a child. The behavioral counselor may observe the family directly

in the home (Patterson, 1968) or establish standardized clinic situations (Hanf, 1969). In any event, specific counts are taken of behaviors between family members so that the reward system which is maintaining the undesirable behavior is made clear. Specific intervention, which may include systematic training of a family member, is then carried out. This is often a matter of learning how to make rewards contingent upon socially-desirable behavior but it may also include increasing the repertoire of behavior, e.g. learning how to express affection to a child or to punish him effectively. A growing part of this behavioral approach is the utilization of videotape both for obtaining accurate observations and for modeling "more desirable" behavior just as any training film might be employed in a course.

Masters and Johnson are in a class all by themselves in the creativity, directness, scientific rigor, and comprehensiveness of their marriage counseling. Starting with their pioneer laboratory studies of human sexuality, they have moved to a sexually-based treatment program (1970). It is to their credit that they place marital sexuality in the context of the total relationship and communication. While it has been fashionable in recent years (not without some validity) to emphasize that sexual problems are "symptoms of communication problems," Masters and Johnson remind us that "if you can't communicate in bed, you probably can't communicate in marriage." These revolutionary scientist-therapists do not detract from the contributions outlined above, but they do show how directly dramatic treatment can be when we are serious enough and

courageous enough about solving social problems. They directly train their troubled couples in being more sexually adequate and so take their place in the overall trend, noted above, which has moved away from talking with an individual toward more social, action-oriented interventions.

3) Family Life Education.

There never will be enough in the way of counseling and psychotherapy to cope with the flood of troubled marriages. As Davis (1944) has pointed out long ago, the number of highly trained professional counselors will never stem the flood of divorces we observe annually. The public would be misguided in placing a magic faith in "marriage counseling" or massive mental health programs, especially with anachronistic delivery systems that are wasteful of the limited resources. What then of "prevention" and the public schools?

If the small family unit has shown signs of wear and tear so that some observers are ready to give up on it completely, the public school system has been asked to pick up the pieces in the socialization of children. The three R's occupy only a portion of the responsibility; the community has shifted to the educational institutions. The school system has been asked to solve family and social problems by turning out products sophisticated in democratic decision making, sound in personal character, vocationally prepared, and socially self-confident. The community has asked the school to serve as an unofficial "mental hospital," therapeutically correcting the damage to development that a disorganized family visits upon its children. The school system has picked up the challenge to family life education with amazingly good spirit but often with equal timidity. Intimidated school administrators

have had to cope with organizations like the John Birch Society which confabulates some bizarre link between sex education and concern about children's teeth (flouridation) as a communist conspiracy!

Family life education has been supported by communities universally in areas such as traditional home economics; furthermore, Oregon has been a pioneer in utilizing high quality "sex education" films like Human Growth. Unfortunately, these educational programs are often like foreign bodies in the curriculum instead of a systematic progression from the kindergarten. At times, this kind of education is worse than none at all; for, as Kinsey (1953) informed us, the young woman teacher may not have as much sexual sophistication as the teenage boys in her class. If we become serious about family life education as "preventive treatment" for family failure, the program will take trained, courageous leadership. Youngsters will have to be exposed to experiential learning--primary grade kids discussing values and "getting along"--in addition to genuine candor about sexuality. Needless to say, leadership for this kind of movement within the public school system is modest.

Another aspect of family life education and prevention of family failures might be a stepped-up program of premarital counseling. This could be much more of a high-powered "cram course" in human relationships, in human sexuality and in economic planning. Some premarital counseling is now carried out by conscientious pastors but too often it is perfunctory or narrow. The premarital counseling is most acceptable as a "prep course" and not addressed to the question: "Should we marry?" The possibility of special guidance based on prediction is there but it is very threatening. There is currently some

crude prediction that is feasible in terms of individual adequacy as well as dyad compatibility. Certainly individuals who fail in their marriages often have a history of unhappy parents in conflict. (Locke, 1951) and there is a tendency of "neurotics to marry neurotics and be doubly damned." (Tharp, 1963) Despite the fact that divorcing mates show many severe symptoms of psychiatric disturbance (Pond, et al, 1963; Murstein & Glaudin, 1968), it would be unfair to generalize that they are "sick" since, for instance, so many make successful second marriages. It can be said that the preponderance of evidence suggests the more similar the engaged man and woman are, both culturally and in personality style, the more easily they form a successful partnership (Tharp, 1963). Perhaps family life education and premarital counseling could make a rich variety of data available to couples on a voluntary basis much as we now do in vocational guidance, i. e. "the odds are xyz that you will succeed if you take abc into account." Any advancement in social science technology where this kind of guidance becomes accurate for the individual case will have to be balanced by the need to preserve civil rights and the core values of a free society; however, the population explosion may ultimately raise the question of whether marriage and reproduction are "inalienable rights" or come to be defined more as "privileges and responsibilities."

APPENDIX B

SUPPLEMENTARY DATA FROM GOOD'S RESEARCH

William Goode's 1948 interview study of more than 400 divorced mothers from metropolitan Detroit is given special emphasis in this paper. It is the most substantial source of data uncovered in the literature. These findings are contained in Goode's volume, After Divorce (1956). It was judged that some of his data, contained in many tables in his book, were worthwhile to be summarized here. It is important to keep in mind, when examining the results, that all findings are based on the reports of the mothers only.

Frequency of Permitted Visits

High Frequency

at any time	32%	
weekly	25%	
		57%

Low Frequency

monthly	3%	
summers and/or holidays	2%	
none arranged	19%	
husband away	18%	
no answers	1%	
		43%

Mother's Preference for Frequency of Visitation

More Often	21%
Satisfied	44%
Less Often	20%
Stop Completely	14%

Mother's desire to have the father visit the children more or less frequently by whether his visits made them harder to handle.

After his visits, were
children harder to handle?

Frequency of visits desired

	More	Same	Less	N
Easier	50%	40%	10%	10
Same	25%	59%	16%	178
Harder	20%	37%	43%	20

286

Mother's desire to have father visit the children more or less frequently by children's feelings toward father.

Feelings of children
toward father.

Frequency of visits desired

	More	Same	Less	N
Love father more	31%	51%	17%	35
Same as always	22%	52%	26%	174
Love him less or always disliked him	27%	34%	39%	64
Do not remember, never think about him	15%	40%	45%	105

378

Mother's desire to have father visit the children more or less frequently by steadiness of his child support payments.

Continuity of Support

Frequency of visits desired

	More	Same	Less	N
Usually or always pays	23%	54%	23%	196
Occasionally or seldom	21%	39%	40%	85
Never pays	23%	33%	44%	61

342

Mother's desire to have father visit the children more or less frequently by whether she ever wanted him to be punished.

Ever want ex-husband
to be punished?

Frequency of visits desired

	More	Same	Less	None	N
Yes, still do	18%	34%	27%	22%	113
Yes, not anymore	21%	42%	25%	12%	81
No	23%	50%	15%	11%	209

403

Percentage of Mothers with custody whose children were "ever" hard to handle by the divorce trauma index.

Trauma Index	Percentage	N
high	54%	112
middle high	52%	58
medium	46%	87
medium low	38%	34
low	33%	112
		403

APPENDIX C

I. Outline used for essays in contacts with Servetus Club

SOME REMINDERS

We are interested in your experience concerning visitation arrangements. Tell it any way you want. Emphasize what you want. Style, spelling, etc. are not important to us.

Please describe the kind of visiting arrangements you now have. Describe the way they used to be. We are interested in the facts now and what they were earlier. We are interested in your feelings now and what they were earlier.

Don't limit yourself to the following ideas, but they may help you get started:

Exactly when does visiting occur? How frequently?
What about special occasions and vacations?

How do you view the welfare of the children being influenced by the visitation?

How does money play a role in visitation?

Are there any special satisfactions in the visitation arrangements that you have worked out? To whom? Any special problems? What are your ideas about a term like "meaningful visitation"?

What feelings do you and your ex-mate have in working out visiting? How do you handle this? How have you worked out decisions about visitation? Changes in the arrangement? How would you describe your visitation relationship with your ex-mate? Business-like? Friendly? Bitter struggle? etc.

How have other people such as new mates, in-laws, other children, etc., helped or complicated visitation?

After you have told your story, please feel free to express your opinions and recommendations of what ought to be. We will organize the data and feed it back to the court. How could the court have been more

helpful? What should be done in this area of visitation? Please don't mix up these "shoulds" and recommendations with the facts of your experience.

We don't need to know your name, but we do need some identifying information such as your age, occupation, how long you have been divorced, and ages of your children. If you are interested in participating in an individual or group discussion about visiting arrangements, please include your name, address and telephone number.

II. Essay by non-custodial father contacted through Servetus Club

My wife and I separated almost two years ago, and the divorce was final about six months ago. I have the two step-children, and we have two children from our marriage. At the time of the separation their ages were: girl 17; three boys 16, 12 and 11. I am a marine surveyor employed by XX Company. In my discussion of the children I refer only to the younger boys. My relationship with my step-son is cordial. Of late we see one another infrequently, although he knows that I am always available if he needs me. Currently he has dropped out, but I suspect he will eventually rejoin the establishment. I have a warm relationship with my step-daughter who is now a sophomore at a university. We see one another occasionally and correspond by mail at times. I believe we have a great deal of mutual respect for one another, and I'm not aware of any particular problems between us.

While the divorce was pending and no final agreement had yet been reached, there were occasional instances of friction concerned with visitation rights. However, most of the complications arose because I did not own a car and transportation of the children presented a problem. Understandably, my former wife was sometimes reluctant to drive the children to my apartment, or to pick them up late at night. Since the divorce has been granted and the agreement signed (and she has remarried), there are really no difficulties in so far as concluding arrangements to spend time with the children. I think we both felt then that we didn't want the children to be used as pawns, and this attitude has been maintained in the post-divorce period.

I have deliberately avoided setting a time schedule for visits with the children because I do not want our relationship to develop into a

pattern of routine obligation for them. I generally manage to see them weekly, or at least semi-monthly, and almost invariably I have something planned for them--some form of entertainment or sports event. This is hardly the most mutually satisfactory arrangement, but it is actually the only one which is possible under the circumstances.

I live alone in a downtown apartment. Thus, whenever they visit me, they are restricted to sedentary diversions. Their visits are comparatively brief; we sometimes meet just prior to a performance, and often they depart soon after. Usually I see them together, although if I arrange something which I know would appeal to just one and not the other, I do see them separately. On one or two occasions the younger boy has stayed overnight at my apartment. The greatest amount of time we have spent together was this past summer when we were camping for several days, which was a most enjoyable experience for me.

My particular problem, and in my discussions with other fathers I find it is not an isolated one, is not the visitation arrangements per se, but rather the difficulty of achieving, to use your term, a "meaningful visitation." I believe there are three basic obstacles which prevent it from occurring:

1. The complete artificiality of the circumstances surrounding the meeting of the children with the parent, including the physical differences between the homes.
2. The lack of continuity in the relationship between the children and the parent, where the daily struggles--the joys and sorrows of intimate sharing--are reduced to their sporadic recital of unconnected incidents, with unfamiliar names and unfamiliar activities. The parent can only pretend to follow this, but it has no reality for him.

3. The loyalty test which the children are confronted with at each meeting. As the non-custodial parent, I am acutely aware of the tight-rope they walk, of the boundaries which must not be crossed, and the inhibitions and self-censorship imposed on everyone. This must be particularly trying to them now since they have a new stepfather, and where they feel the pull of a dual allegiance.

Although I eagerly look forward to seeing them, each visit is a private trauma, and I'm not so sure that we are not, all of us, a little worse off for the experience. I believe, under more propitious circumstances, the visits could become more meaningful. That is, if my personal position were more conventional; if I were sharing a home with someone, and could invite them to become part of a family-oriented situation.

This introduces still another aspect of the visitation problem which spills over to the non-custodial parent's social activities. Most social events for adults are scheduled around weekends. During the school year visits with children are usually limited to weekends as well. The conflicting times often present a rather awkward choice. Although it is sometimes possible to combine visits with the children and adult activities on the same day, it is not a very satisfactory arrangement. This apportioning of time frequently leaves one with guilt feelings. Additionally, problems sometimes arise when the children's visits coincide with the man's social activities. There is a general uneasiness in the matter of introductions and explanations, particularly when the man and his lady friend have a rather casual relationship.

The difficulties encountered in maintaining a free and easy relationship between the parent and the children continues to build up with each subsequent visit, until future meetings are often approached

with some trepidation. Particular anguish, of course, is invariably experienced at the conclusion of each meeting when we go our separate ways.

I don't know what the courts can do in the area of visitation under the present system. However, if it were possible to initiate new procedures, I would suggest the following:

That as a condition to granting a divorce, a competent, professional social worker or psychologist be directed to acquaint the minor children with what they might expect in the aftermath of a divorce, and what adjustment they will have to make to accommodate themselves to this new situation. If practicable, this should be held after a talk with both parents in order that he could have more detailed knowledge of the particulars surrounding the divorce and could relate this to the personalities involved. I feel that both the children and the parents would greatly benefit from a preparatory session, and it would enable all of them to face the future with a more hopeful attitude. It also occurred to me in line with the above suggestion that perhaps there could be an additional follow-up for parents in the form of lectures or short courses dealing with adjustments which must be made by the newly divorced parent.

I trust this information will be of some use to you in your very worthwhile project. If additional data is required, I would be glad to cooperate.

Sincerely,

XXX

APPENDIX D

OFFICIAL FORMS FOR SUBJECT POOL DATA

1. Bureau of Vital Statistics

RECORD OF DIVORCE OR ANNULMENT

STATE OF OREGON—STATE BOARD OF HEALTH

VITAL STATISTICS SECTION

On this date:

STATE FILE NO. 246-182

COUNTY: Multnomah

COUNTY FILE NO. 002510

HUSBAND

FULL NAME

: Joe B. Smith

PLACE OF BIRTH (CITY OR TOWN) (STATE OR COUNTRY)

: North Dakota

DATE OF BIRTH

: 6/10/10

AGE

: 20

COLOR OR RACE

: White

OCCUPATION

: Ins. Agent, Life

NUMBER OF THIS MARRIAGE

: First

BUSINESS OR INDUSTRY

: Insurance

USUAL RESIDENCE (STREET OR RURAL RT. NO.)

: 31203 N. E. Bruce, Portland, Oreg.

(CITY OR TOWN)

(STATE OR COUNTRY)

WIFE

FULL MAIDEN NAME

: Doris Jean Smith

PREVIOUS MARRIED NAME—IF ANY

: None

PLACE OF BIRTH (CITY OR TOWN) (STATE OR COUNTRY)

: East St. Louis Illinois

DATE OF BIRTH

: 2/23/37

AGE

: 22

COLOR OR RACE

: White

OCCUPATION

: Secretary

NUMBER OF THIS MARRIAGE

: 2nd

BUSINESS OR INDUSTRY

: Insurance

USUAL RESIDENCE (STREET OR RURAL RT. NO.)

: 31203 N. E. Bruce, Portland, Oreg.

(CITY OR TOWN)

(STATE OR COUNTRY)

PLACE OF MARRIAGE (CITY OR TOWN) (STATE OF COUNTRY)

: 1212 1st St, Detroit

DATE OF MARRIAGE

: 12-31-37

PLAINTIFF

☐ HUSBAND ☒ WIFE

DIVORCE GRANTED TO:

☐ HUSBAND ☒ WIFE

DATE OF DIVORCE

: 6-15-66

NUMBER OF CHILDREN UNDER 18
AFFECTED BY DECREE:

1

LEGAL GROUNDS OR
CAUSE OF DIVORCE: (IF ANNULMENT—SO STATE)

: 12-31-37

A DECREE OF

(DIVORCE OR ANNULMENT)

WAS FILED

6-15-66

(DATE)

CONCERNING THE ABOVE MARRIAGE

SIGNATURE OF COUNTY OFFICIAL

TITLE OF COUNTY OFFICIAL

APPENDIX E

GUIDELINES FOR CONTACTING SUBJECTS

I. Telephone Contacts

The following outline seemed to work with considerable success for "cold contact" telephoning. It must be considered a "model" rather than taken as a rigid format. Although the introductory comments were followed almost verbatim, flexibility was the key thereafter in quickly developing a cooperative relationship. The order of the information outlined here was often changed to suit the individual conversation.

I am (first and last name), a graduate student in the Portland State University School of Social Work. I am part of a group involved in a research project regarding child visitation arrangements. We are making this study at the request of Judge Jean Lewis, Judges Dahl and Lennon of the Multnomah County Court.

Your name was selected at random from the court files. At this point, we are interested in finding out if you would be willing to have an interview with one of us concerning the visitation arrangements you have worked out and how well these arrangements are working. We would like very much to talk to you, as your experiences concerning visitations and feelings about this are important to our study.

All information is confidential. We will not identify any person. Even the Judges will not know your identity.

Where resistance is encountered, the students attempt to explore reluctance in terms of the reasons for it while accepting feelings and respecting this decision.

CIRCUIT COURT OF OREGON

Fourth Judicial District - Dept. No. 12

County Court House

Portland 4, Oregon

Jean L. Lewis
Judge

A graduate research group at the School of Social Work at Portland State University under the sponsorship of the Court of Domestic Relations is studying ways in which divorced couples work out visitation rights.

The project was developed originally because of the Court of Domestic Relations' concern in regard to the fact that, although some divorced couples are able to make visitation arrangements that work well, other divorced couples find the situation filled with problems.

The research group is endeavoring to learn more about visitation, and we are hoping you will grant time for a short interview. They need your help and experience in studying how divorced people arrange visitation for their children. All information will be held in the strictest confidence.

Since we are unable to locate your telephone number, would you be kind enough to mark the appropriate box and return the enclosed card as soon as possible.

Yours very truly,

Jean L. Lewis

JLL:gw

APPENDIX F

BROAD GUIDELINES FOR SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS

We are interested in your experience concerning visitation arrangements. Tell about it any way you want. Emphasize what you want.

Please describe the visiting arrangements you now have. Describe the way they used to be. We are interested in the facts now and what they were earlier. We are interested in your feelings now and what they were earlier.

Don't limit yourself to the following ideas, but they may help you get started:

Exactly when does visiting occur? How frequently? What about special occasions and vacations?

How do you view the welfare of the children being influenced by visitation?

How does money play a role in visitation?

Are there any special satisfactions in the visitation arrangements that you have worked out? To whom? Any special problems? What are your ideas about a term like "meaningful visitation"?

What feelings do you and your ex-mate have in working out visiting? How do you handle this? How have you worked out decision about visitation relationship with your ex-mate? Business-like? Friendly? Bitter struggle? etc.

How have other people such as new mates, in-laws, other children, etc. helped or complicated visitation?

Please feel free to express your opinions and recommendations of what ought to be. We will organize the data and feed it back to the court. How could the court have been more helpful? What should be done in this area of visitation?

Case #1

Interviewer: EM

Type: Non-Custodial Father Divorced 1965.

This thirty year old father of an eight year old boy was divorced in 1965 and neither he nor his ex-wife has remarried.

Visitation at first had been for a full day, once a week on the weekend. Father now averages two full days, twice a month. In addition, he visits with his son two weeks during the summer vacation plus one week at Christmas vacation. Father reports that this current arrangement is satisfactory to all.

There is little direct contact between the parents. This was described as a businesslike arrangement with superficial friendliness.

The father stated one area of concern to which he returned several times during the interview--the mother's "boyfriends." Father feels that this "confuses" the son. Father said he felt his son may feel "guilty" over this fact. This was never further explained despite its repeated focus. Interviewer had a question about the father projecting some of his own feelings in the matter onto his son.

The father had no particular recommendations to make to the court. He believes that all matters concerning visitation have worked out about as well as might be expected. He expressed appreciation for the fact that the mother sees the relationship between the father and son as a positive one and does nothing to discourage it.

Case # 2
Interviewer: EM
Type: Custodial Mother Divorced 1965

This forty-eight year old mother, who was divorced in 1965, was granted custody of three children, now twenty, seventeen and ten years old. The two oldest children are girls who are said to be indifferent about seeing their father. The youngest boy is the only child not actively involved in a visitation arrangement. The mother is employed as a claims auditor in an insurance company and the home reflects middle class standards.

Visitation now takes place about every six weeks on an afternoon on the weekend. This is always initiated by the boy or the mother, never by the father according to the mother's report. The interview portrayed the boy as always looking forward to the visits "very much." The father and boy generally go to a show or some other entertainment event.

According to the mother, school teachers have reported their concern over what they view as the boy's sense of rejection by the father. The mother states that she has tried to encourage visitation, which she views as important to her son. The mother feels that the father, now remarried, is just "too busy" with his new life to give much time to the son. She feels the father does not realize how much meaning he has to the son.

The contacts between the mother and father are "friendly" but the father is described as "unresponsive" to the mother's attempts to discuss the need for increased visiting.

The mother wished the court would provide counseling for the

father which would be aimed in helping him to realize the importance of a continuing relationship between father and son. She feels this important to the girls as well. She did not seem to be aware of the services which might be available through the Family Services Department.

The interviewer had the impression that possibly the mother was indirectly asking for more contact between herself and the father in regard to her own feelings as well as those of her son. It was difficult to tell how much she might be projecting her own feelings when she was describing her son's sense of rejection.

Case # 3

Interviewer: G.H.

Type: Custodial Mother Divorced 1965

This forty-five year old divorced mother was married seventeen years and divorced in 1965. The children were twelve (son) and fourteen (daughter) at the time of the divorce. Mr. is a fifty-six year old salesman who travels some, and she is an elementary school teacher. Neither has remarried.

The children visit with the father every other weekend. The court set down these guidelines and they all follow them explicitly. There are no complications according to the mother.

The father takes the children on outings to the beach and to Canada. The mother hasn't seen the father in several years. She never speaks to him or about him. She feels there are no problems, conflict, or support issues. They have their same home and the support is adequate. The mother believes the children should not be used as pawns; they have a father and a mother even if marriage didn't work out. There has been no custody issue since the father felt that his traveling precluded any consideration of his managing children. She reports that neither she nor he "drink" and there are no real problems in the visiting arrangement from her standpoint.

Mother feels the children have no important problems and have not had any since the divorce. She "just explained to them that this is the way it was."

Mother tried for seven years to get the divorce because they did not live together anyway. The husband allegedly contested her efforts. "Guess he just wanted a place to hang his hat when he did come

home." Mother says she had to hire seven attorneys before she found a "good one." She seemed to discuss this kind of material and to resist any focus on visitation or recommendations to the court.

It seemed to the interviewer that this woman has a rather rigid view of life and she just "cut the marriage with a cleaver." Interviewer is not surprised she has not remarried since there was no discussion of feelings of others involved. She was only aware of her own feelings and had no doubt about what was "right or wrong."

Her only recommendation was: "Get a good attorney." She seemed to want to end the conversation and not talk about her husband any more. Feelings were running high.

Case # 4

Interviewer: G. H.

Type: Custodia, Mother Divorced 1965

This woman was married twenty years and has a seventeen year old son. The boy's custody was awarded to the mother without contest. Mother reports that the father traveled a good deal and saw little of the son anyway. The father is a general contractor with three years of college. He was described as "not overly interested" in the son before divorce and the same pattern has continued.

The father and son visit about once a month now. Mother feels that father's remarriage has put further damper on the relationship. Father's second wife has two sons which is seen as complicating matters. Mother reports that it is set up so that the son could decide about visitation, but going to college makes visitation difficult.

Mother was not remarried. She always seem concerned that divorce and her personal problems did not interfere with the boy's relationship with his father. Even though she was bitter at time of divorce, she feels that her son should not know. The father is viewed as "mature" in the same style. Father's only request was that the son keep the father's name even if the mother remarried.

The parents made a cash settlement which was to be paid to ex-wife monthly through the court. This money was largely intended for college education for the son. This is still the case as the son has enrolled at the University of Oregon.

"Meaningful visitation" to this woman suggests that the parents "not interfere with the son's life." The boy should continue to have two parents who are interested in him.

Case # 5

Interviewer: B. G.

Type: Custodial Mother Divorced in 1969

Mrs. B. is twenty-four years old, she has two children, a daughter, age 7 and son, age 4; she was married for seven years and divorced in August of 1969. Mrs. B. has worked steadily throughout her marriage except for the periods of her confinement. She took a business course in high school and learned to type well. She has participated in O. E. O. (Multnomah Service Center) programs and steadily improved her employment status. She is currently employed as a secretary in a bank. Mrs. B. remarked that all of her positions were obtained through friends, that she has never interviewed for a job in which she was unknown to the employer.

This woman feels that she married an irresponsible and immature man and that she was obliged to carry on where his mother left off. She felt that she had taken two years to make the decision to divorce him and that it was made on the basis of his irresponsibility. She believes he still has feelings for her and would remarry her if he could.

Mrs. B. stated that visitation was arranged at his request, but that he interpreted her cooperation with visitation arrangements as a renewal of interest in him. She believes that the children have good feelings about their father and that visiting him was a satisfying experience for them. She stated that when he was employed, he asked to see the children about every two weeks, but that when he was unemployed, the requests were much further apart. She felt that this was due to his feeling about himself. He had not asked nor visited the

children over Christmas and she felt that this was due to his unemployment and consequent inability to give them gifts.

She was of the opinion that support payments had a strong effect on visitation in that her former husband's inability or refusal to provide support resulted in his being unable to follow through in the area of relationship with his children.

Mrs. B. said that she had been to court three times since the original decree was granted because of non-support. The original decree orders support payments of \$150.00 per month for the two children. Mr. B. has paid this amount once in the thirteen months since the divorce. She stated the court had been far too easy on her husband and that he could take more responsibility if the court were firm with him.

She also stated that in her opinion, the court should stipulate regular visitation as the children needed to see their father and he needed to accept his responsibility to them.

I asked if she had considered marriage counseling prior to the divorce and she replied that she had, but had decided against it:

"Married people should be mature enough to work things out themselves."

Mrs. B. gave the impression of being a strong, independent and open person. The children seemed happy and outgoing as they were observed in the home. The house was clean and attractively furnished and in the heart of the black ghetto.

Case # 6

Interviewer: B. G.

Type: Custodial Father Divorced 1969

Mr. F., the only Negro in this sample of interviewees, states he was married for four and one-half years and divorced for six months before this. At the time of marriage, he was 21 and she was 17. He met and married her in Los Angeles where he was a salesman and away from home (Portland) for the first time. The father has custody of their one son, age four and one-half, who has been raised in Portland all his life.

This young father talked a great deal about his ex-wife and said she was a "loving and devoted mother to their son" but that she "ran around" when he was on the road selling. He says she began to drink heavily and became "completely irresponsible and immature." He reports that she talked repeatedly about leaving him but that she never did. He finally took action and Mrs. F. requested marriage counseling through Family Services Department; however, his mind was made up and went to just one session.

When they first separated, Mrs. F. took the child with her for a short period but then gave the boy to her mother-in-law, stating she could not take care of him. The interviewee was living at home (not traveling) and petitioned the court for the custody claiming his ex-wife was "morally unfit." He expresses some guilt about this. Later, the mother visited the small son for a few weeks and the parents saw each other frequently during this time. He allowed the mother to visit very freely at her convenience. The father feels that the more frequently the boy sees his mother the better to reduce the sense of

rejection. During the interview, this pre-schooler was observed and heard to say he "missed mommy. "

Mr. F. remarried in January 1970. The step-mother was present but did not participate in the interview. The minor child calls her by her first name and the relationship seemed friendly in both directions. The ex-wife is "upset" about the remarriage and is reported to have vowed "never to see the boy again. "

The paternal grandmother is described as more accepting of the new Mrs. F. but that she "never liked" the former one. The present step-mother is a "Bible student." The interviewee described his mother as taking much responsibility in caring for his son, especially before his remarriage.

This man gave the impression of being "immature and dependent" as a person. The socio-economic status appeared generally below average and the educational tone was characteristic of high school graduate or below. Mr. F. is presently unemployed but says his work as a housepainter is seasonal. Since he has custody, no support payments are involved.

Case # 7

Interviewer: E. V.

Type: Non-Custodial Father Divorced 1965

Mr. Robert M., age 49, and his wife, Frances, age 42, were married, each for the first time on 7/27/47 and divorced 8/21/65. Mr. has been employed for many years as a driver-salesman for a large commercial laundry and his wife has worked as a buyer for ladies' clothing stores for most of the marriage.

Following the divorce, the mother moved to Eugene and is in the same employment there. There was one child, a son, from this marriage. At the time of the divorce, the boy was in high school and he currently attends the University of Oregon.

The father was interviewed at the Herford House, an apartment which provides both room and board and is roughly lower middle class in character. When interviewed, Mr. M. was very cooperative, highly verbal, and he seemed pleased with the interest shown by the interviewer.

Visiting occurs entirely at the wish of the son, and has never been an issue between the parents. Mr. M. stated his son comes to Portland "about half a dozen" times per year and sometimes stays overnight with him. At such times, the boy usually asks for money which the father stated he is glad to give. This usually amounts to \$20 at a time. In addition, the father sends money for tuition but otherwise provides no support with the explanation that his wife "makes as much as I do." When questioned concerning the visits of the boy, Mr. M. stated the wife had no objection. He said he had no reason to object to the boy choosing to stay with his mother, and he said it was probably best for the boy. He explained that he and his son were "never very close,"

the boy being described as "mamma's boy" when younger. Actually, the relationship between the boy and father has been much better following the divorce, according to Mr. M.

The interviewer was impressed with the lack of affect on the part of Mr. over the divorce; and his attitude towards both his wife and son seemed most neutral, lacking in emotional overtones either positive or negative. A matter-of-fact attitude would best describe the responses. The divorce had been granted the wife on grounds of desertion. The interviewer gained the impression that Mr. M. either had never formed very close relationships with his wife and son or if there were close feeling, these were resolved long ago. The possibility that Mr. M. has never been capable of very deep emotional attachments also occurred to the interviewer. Neither parent has remarried and Mr. does not contemplate this. All grandparents are deceased and played no part in the total marital situation.

Case # 8

Interviewer: E. V.

Type: Non-Custodial Father Divorced 1969

Mr. Russell C., age 32, and his first wife, age 30, were married in 1957 and divorced in 1965. Mrs. has the custody of their only child, a boy age 12. Both have remarried. Mr. has two step-daughters ages 6 and 8 years. Mrs. has had no additional children.

This father was highly cooperative. He explained that visiting occurred about every three months, for a weekend at a time. Family outings to the beach or mountains are planned. In the summer visits are about one weekend per month. Mr. said the boy seemed pleased with the arrangements and he has not asked for more frequent visiting.

This man said that he and his ex-wife get along in "friendly" fashion. Mr. said he calls at least a week in advance prior to a visit. Mr. said he and his ex-wife decided that "too much visiting" might be bad for the relationship between the boy and his new stepfather. Since the boy has not asked to spend more time with his father and seems to be getting along well with his stepfather, the divorced parents have felt the current arrangement is working quite well. Mr. said he and his ex-wife have agreed that the boy is old enough to have his wishes respected by both. They would do this up to a once-a-month frequency in visiting at the son's request. The father doubted that visiting more often than this would be good "for all concerned."

Mr. C. said his boy is an excellent student, likes science and reads a lot. He was described as "a quiet kid with real good manners." The father said this with pride. When visiting, the boy was said to get along "fine" with the father's second wife and his two stepdaughters.

They were said to "adore" him and want him to visit more often.

Mr. C. is in the insurance business and maintains a middle class life style. He pays \$75.00 per month support for his son. When questioned about his continuing support payment in view of the mother's remarriage, the father said he considered his support payment an obligation on his part and that he was happy to fulfill it. He then added: "The boy thinks a lot of me and I wouldn't want an issue like that to come between us." He went on to explain that when he had a heart attack a year ago, he was unable to make payments for six months. He said his ex-wife "understood" and did not press him. When he was able to resume payments, she was happy to receive them. The interviewer gained the impression that money and its use is closely tied to the expression of affection in Mr. C.'s mind.

Concerning the divorce, Mr. said it was mainly his "fault," that he had married "too young" and had spent so much time on business he had neglected to give enough attention to his wife and son. He said that it took a heart attack to teach him the value of leisure and that "making money wasn't everything." Even so, the interviewer had the feeling Mr. C. spends the great majority of his time and energy in the pursuit of money. He gave the impression of a man who has an almost compulsive need to plan, to have order and to minimize chance as a factor in his life. There are no paternal grandparents or relatives but the boy has a close relationship with a maternal grandmother who "dotes on him and spoils him rotten." This was Mrs. C.'s only implied expression of hostility.

Case #9

Interviewer: A. W.

Type: Non-Custodial Father Divorced 1967

This divorced father is a 36 year old self-employed carpenter who was married 15 years and has been remarried for a year and one-half. His ex-wife remarried less than a year ago and works at a dry cleaners. She has custody of their four children: two girls, 17 and 15, two boys, 13 and 7.

Mr. H. Says that the judge made the couple's visitation arrangements pretty explicit. He is allowed to have the four children every other Sunday from 1 to 7 p.m. and for three consecutive weeks in the summer. The three weeks' vacation is to be arranged by the divorced parents at their discretion.

This man feels that some additional provision should have been made for holidays and the family birthdays. He says that when he has tried to get his wife to let him have the children on those occasions, she has refused at times, stating "It isn't your day." On other occasions when he makes such a request, she is said to be willing as long as it is to her personal benefit. On occasion the custodial mother has called and even asked him to take the children because she wanted to "get away."

Although Mr. rather resents the alleged fact that the court did not consult him or his wife about arrangements they would prefer in visitation, he says he definitely feels that very explicit regulations on visitation should be made by the court. He also feels that his expenses while the children are in his care--clothes, extra food, treats, gasoline--should be deducted from the support he contributes to the

custodial parent. In Mr. H. own case, it should be said that he claims to have had to pay for medical expenses for the children, both during visitation and outside of visitation, because his wife either refused or neglected to do so. This non-custodial father also said that he felt that many of the problems of divorce, including those relating to visitation arrangements, could be minimized if the court could conduct both a preliminary and post-divorce study of the family adjustment.

Mr. H. 's manner was at first somewhat guarded but as we progressed, he was able to relax and it was quite evident he has been concerned by some of the problems that have arisen. He stated that his ex-wife has, on one occasion since the divorce, been tried and acquitted on charges of being an unfit mother. He was perturbed about this because he says that he and some of the ex-wife's neighbors showed up to testify against her and were not allowed in the courtroom. In closing he said that if the research students conducting the study needed another interview, he would gladly volunteer.

Case #10

Interviewer: A. W.

Type: Custodial Mother Divorced 1965

Mrs. R. is a 46 year old woman who was married once (1953-65) and now works as a school counselor while in custody of two sons, ages 11 and 14. The father of the children, now 44, is a TV technician who was married previously and has an older daughter living with his first wife.

Mrs. R. is a rather direct, outspoken woman who seemed to relish the chance to have an interested person listen to her story. She immediately indicated that she "wasn't at all happy" with the way things were set up in her visitation. She said that the arrangements were left entirely up to her to work out with her ex-husband. No specific limitations and arrangements were laid down by the court. When they were first separated, she says her ex-husband visited regularly with the boys for about two months. Mrs. R. also reported that was the same length of time that he felt obligated to meet the monthly support payments punctually. After that, the payments began to fall behind and, simultaneously, he lost interest in visitation. Then Mrs. R. says she called the District Attorney's office to instigate pressure on the father for support. "After several months, they got around to notifying him of his tardiness and he began to pay up." The mother claims that her ex-husband then began harrasing her by demanding frequent visitation with the boys. There were many spur-of-the-moment requests to see the boys and, if she refused or complained, he would become "hostile" and "pester in other ways." Many times she felt she had to tell the boys to call her if their father did not start to return them to her by a

certain time. One time, he allegedly refused to return them from a visit at his house; and when she went there to get them, he blocked the doorway and barred their exit.

During these times of his interest in visiting the boys, the father is said to have insisted that it was his right to have the boys with him "whenever he pleased and for as long as he pleased." For a few months his payments would come regularly; "But as soon as he figured the 'heat' was off, the support would stop coming and so would the requests for visitation." Currently, Mrs. R. states that she is in a period in which support payments are eight months behind and it has been a long time since her ex-mate has requested the company of his sons. Over two months ago she asked the court "to build a fire under him again," but she claims she has heard nothing since. She says she is "certain that if she would let him off the hook on the support payments, he would gladly leave her and the boys alone entirely."

Mrs. R. feels that the court should have made it much plainer to her former husband that since she was given full custody of both children the visitation setup was entirely up to her. Of course, she also feels that the court should take a more independently active part in seeing that support payments do not fall in arrears. When this problem first arose, soon after the divorce, she asked for advice from her attorney, but states she was told that she would have to work the matter out with her former spouse herself. Mrs. R. feels that definite visitation arrangements "in black and white" should be set down in explicit form by the court in order to avoid difficulties like her own, which she feels are totally unnecessary.

One further complication to the visitation arrangements came up when Mrs. R. remarried soon after her divorce. Her second husband parted company with her last year, allegedly at her request, due to his alcoholism. While with her, he complicated matters in two ways: His drinking problem gave her first husband "an excuse to demean her morals" and gave him a lever "to use against her in her job as a school counselor." She believes he intimated to her that he would "quit harrassing her" if she would let him stop the payments. Her second husband also "told off" the first husband and the paternal grandparents on some occasions. This step-father to the sons would cause scenes and would not relay messages allowing the boys to visit with their father if he happened to take the phone call.

Case #11

Interviewer: A. W.

Type: Non-Custodial Father Divorced 1965

This is a 38 year old "owner and manager of a hotel" who had been so for 13 years at the time of his divorce. He has two children by that marriage, a daughter, now 16, and a son, 9 years old, who live with the custodial mother in Portland. The interviewee remarried two years ago and has no children from this union. He pays \$250 per month in child support payments and another \$250 per month to buy his wife's interest in some property.

There exists no definite schedule for visitation. The father usually telephones directly to the children to make arrangements for them to come down to visit him. Occasionally they call him either on their own initiative or because their mother is going to be in Corvallis and can bring them down. She gives permission but arrangements are made through the children rather than directly between the parents. There are no definite times, but the boy almost always comes down for the weekends. The girl comes about twice a month.

The son usually stays with the father's parents who have a farm out in the country near Corvallis and the father goes out there to see him. The daughter stays at the hotel when she comes and has her own room there.

They maintain normal family activities depending on the season and the father's free time. The boy enjoys riding, etc. on the farm or fishing with the father.

There is no involvement of the other parent in the visits except to provide transportation some of the time. She leaves if he visits in

Portland or he takes them out of the home.

During the first two years after the divorce, the mother used to live in Corvallis. At that time, he saw them at least twice a week, often dropping by at the house to see them or picking his son up at kindergarten.

The visitation on special days varies. Last Christmas the son was with the father.

The father was somewhat evasive about the visitation relationship between he and his ex-wife but indicated that there was some friction occasionally.

As for the children's attitude toward visitation, the older child, daughter, enjoys coming more since the father has remarried. His son loves to come down to the farm. He feels they have adjusted well and his relationship to them is good.

It was difficult to determine how much friction there is between these parents regarding visitation. The father feels that his ex-wife often decides arbitrarily not to allow the children to come. He feels that she would not let them come at all if he did not pay support. There seems to be some quarrel over the support payments although he says that he has paid regularly. He feels that there should be some way of being sure that the support money is used for the children. He was critical of the term "reasonable visitation" feeling that it was left entirely up to the mother to decide what "reasonable" meant and that they did not agree. I felt that he was making a great effort to impress me as to his devotion to his children and I could not help wondering why he was trying so hard. He mentioned that with a teenager there were more problems in arranging visits because she was often busy with

things at home on weekends. Also, she had felt somewhat at loose ends visiting when he was still single but gets along very well with his second wife, and they do things together.

Case #12

Interviewer: E. M.

Type: Custodial Mother Divorced 1969

The 42 year old woman was divorced from her third husband in 1969 after 15 years of marriage. She said this marriage was "forced" by her pregnancy with her oldest child, a daughter, 15. She also has sons, ages 14 and 11, in her custody.

No regular pattern of visitation has developed and definite arrangements have not been discussed between the parents. Visitation has occurred only twice since the divorce. The father called in advance on those occasions at the custodial home. One of these visits was at Christmas.

The mother offered the opinion that the father is "full of anger and hate" and that he "really doesn't care about the kids." He is said to deeply resent making support payments.

The visits were said to upset the children who allegedly became "unmanageable" following them. Recently the mother remarried and the children are in the process of adjusting to a new stepfather. The mother feels that this is having a positive effect on the children. She believes that despite the disruption caused by divorce, the children "are adjusting well." At present she denies any behavior disorders. The children were described to be increasingly indifferent to visits by the father. The mother said she was not really interested in having the father visit. This was no longer important because the children "have a new father."

There were no recommendations to the court nor any feeling that counseling would be of any value.

While this mother was very outspoken at times, she seemed somewhat less than candid in describing possible reasons for her ex-husband's bitterness. She attempted to control the interview and there was considerable confusion as she tried to describe her feelings as differentiated from the feelings of the children. The interviewer wondered how accurately this mother was able to make judgments about the children's feelings.

Case #13

Interviewer: E. M.

Type: Non-Custodial Father Divorced 1969

This 23 year old father was married for two years before his divorce in 1969. He has a nine month old son in the care of the child's mother.

This young father states that he visits the infant son (and his ex-wife) every Sunday afternoon for a period of four hours. He feels strongly that his ex-wife would limit visitation more if it were not for his support payments. He says he is prompt with these.

The visitation arrangement is complicated by the fact that there is another child in the picture, a two year old toddler allegedly conceived out of wedlock. The father feels bitter about the fact that his ex-wife will not allow him to visit with this step-child, for whom he pays no support. Visitation is also conflicted in terms of frequency according to the father's report. He feels that the mother would like less contact between him and his infant son at her discretion and uses visitation as a way of "getting back at me." The visits themselves are pleasant enough, even friendly until the issue of an agreed upon visitation arrangement is discussed, then there are heated arguments.

This non-custodial father feels very strongly that the court should stipulate visitation and "not leave it to the mother."

The non-custodial father seemed "sincere" and willing to cooperate with the interview, however, there seemed to be little or no awareness that he gave the impression of being self-centered about the visitation issue. He conveyed the impression that he thought of his child and ex-step-child more in terms of his own needs and feelings

rather than a deep concern about them. He currently lives in his parents home with his siblings and seems to identify that as his family. The interviewer was struck with the adolescent quality of his thoughts and attitudes.

Case #14

Interviewer: B. G.

Type: Custodial Mother Divorced 1965

Mr. and Mrs. C. were married 15 years and divorced in 1965. They have two sons, ages 17 and 13. Mr. C. is now 38 and Mrs. C. is 39. Mrs. C. has had secretarial training beyond high school and is employed as a medical secretary. Mr. C. has a Master's Degree in English and has been a junior college teacher. This custodial mother lives in an attractive suburban apartment with all the indications of middle-class standards. She receives support payments regularly.

Mrs. C. was given custody of both children at the time of divorce, but the 17 year old son was made a Ward of the Court and placed in foster care shortly afterwards. About a year and a half ago, he attempted suicide and was subsequently placed in the State Hospital for five months. He is now in a boy's correctional school and reported doing well. Mrs. C. says that he has suffered always from deep depression and was taken from her because she could not control him or his use of hard drugs.

This woman has been under psychiatric care for six years and hospitalized three times for "nervous breakdowns." She appeared extremely depressed and almost wooden, the effect was flat and she sipped liquor from a coffee cup during the interview. She did not want me to leave and kept wanting to tell me more. Her focus wandered and it was difficult to tell about whom she was talking or whether she was talking about the past or present.

Following the divorce, the father took the two boys every Saturday over a period of six or eight weeks. Mrs. C. said the

arrangement was satisfactory both for the boys and for her. The father is then said to have told her that he could not continue regular visitation and did not see the boys for a period of six months. The mother said that during this time, her ex-husband lost his job as a teacher, was drinking heavily, and took a job driving a taxicab. Then in June of 1966, Mr. C. remarried and resumed visitation with the boys--seeing them four times in six weeks. The interviewee stated that six weeks following his remarriage, the new Mrs. C. shot herself in a suicide attempt and was paralyzed for many months. She said that Mr. C. quit working and devoted himself to caring for his injured second wife. He saw the boys once or twice a year during 1967 and 1968 and the visits were unsatisfactory to all concerned. The second Mrs. C. recovered and divorced Mr. C. in 1968. Mr. C. resumed work as a cab dispatcher and began to involve himself with his eldest son who was institutionalized because of his suicidal depression.

Mr. C. now visits the older boy regularly at least twice a month and a relationship has been reestablished between father and son. In contrast, this mother has withdrawn from her son saying she cannot tolerate seeing him in the closed institutional setting. She said she visited once and had severe phobic reactions followed by her own hospitalization.

I met the younger son during the interview. He is an eighth grader who is reported to be an outstanding student--editor of the school paper, class president, and involved in many school activities including drama and sports. He was very kind to his mother asking if he could get her anything. He then retired to his bedroom to study, taking his dog with him. He seemed very self-contained and somehow

removed from the whole milieu.

The younger son sees his father occasionally upon his own request but expects little from him.

Case #15

Interviewer: B. G.

Type: Custodial Mother Divorced 1965

Mr. and Mrs. D. were married 19 years and divorced in October of 1965. They are both college educated, professional people. Mr. D. is executive director of a management analysis firm and Mrs. D. is Public Relations Director of a nationwide women's charitable organization. At the time of the divorce, she was director of public relations at a sectarian women's institution of higher learning. Mrs. D. suffered a loss of prestige in her former position because of her divorced status and, therefore, sought a change of employment. She is now remarried and lives in an elite residential area. She gives the impression of being intelligent and sophisticated.

Mr. and Mrs. D. have three children, Peter, now age 22; Susan, now 18; and Johnny, now 15.

Mr. and Mrs. D. were separated for eighteen months prior to the divorce. During this period of time, Mr. D. is said to have been drinking very heavily and forced to change jobs. He subsequently filed for divorce and Mrs. D. cross-filed naming the woman whom he later married as correspondent. Peter testified on his mother's behalf and severed all relations with his father. Peter was in college at the time of the divorce, is now a reporter and established in his own home. The mother reports that he is still very bitter towards his father and he refuses to see him or re-establish any communication with him. Mrs. D. knows this is destructive for Peter as well as his father, and feels somewhat responsible for allowing this to happen.

This custodial mother was remarried in June of 1967 to a prominent local architect. She says she is happy and secure in her marriage but feels the complexities for the children are enormous.

In this situation, visitation has been on an individual basis.

Peter has never visited his father; Susan was close to her father and has visited him regularly once or twice a month.. Johnny is described as ambivalent and sometimes sees him regularly and sometimes refuses to see him at all.

Mrs. D. feels that she has inadvertently influenced the children's attitudes toward their father more than she intended or meant to do. She also feels partially responsible for their dislike of their stepmother. She believes this woman to be controlling and emasculating.

The father has paid large support payments regularly and Mrs. D. does not see a relationship between support payment and visitation.

Case #16

Interviewer: E. V.

Type: Non-Custodial Father Divorced 1969

Mr. M. , age 40, and his ex-wife, age 39 were divorced less than a year ago. The wife immediately remarried after the six months waiting period. There are two children: a girl, age 19, who is living independently and working; and a boy, age 13, who lives with his mother and new stepfather. Mr. M. sees the boy once a week for all day, either on a Saturday or a Sunday. Mr. M. pays \$75.00 per month child support for the boy, none for the girl. Mr. M. is a machinist by trade and works steadily.

According to the father, he and his ex-wife parted, on reasonable good terms. Visiting arrangements are informal and the wife readily agreed to one day per week. Sometimes, when the father plans a weekend fishing trip the boy goes for two days. Mr. M. said there were no problems over visitation, they both tried to adjust to the wishes of the son. The boy in turn was said to be making a good adjustment to his new stepfather. Mr. M. said he did not resent this as "we have always been close...we really like each other." Mr. M. went on to describe the boy's accomplishments with obvious pride. (The boy was said to be planning a career as a psychologist or a social worker). The father rarely sees his daughter except "when she wants to borrow money." The father said she has her own life now and plans to be married this next summer.

Mr. M. was quite vague over the cause of the divorce and there seemed to be a strange lack of negative feeling over the quick remarriage of his wife and subsequent new father person on the scene.

Mr. said he had no plans to marry again.

The attitude of Mr. M. seemed to be one of wishing to impress the interviewer with how mature and reasonable everyone was, but it seemed hard to believe that all this has happened with so little stress and strain as the father reported. He seemed to be a warm person with the capacity to have considerable feeling. His expressions of affection for his son seemed deep and genuine.

Case #17

Interviewer: E. V.

Type: Custodial Mother Divorced 1969

Mr. and Mrs. T., ages 24 and 23 respectively, were married five years and divorced September, 1969. There are two children, ages 2 and 4. Mr. is an office employee with a railroad, and Mrs. is a full-time student in her junior year at an university. Mr. pays \$150 per month child support through the court. In addition, the parents of Mrs. T. help both with money and some babysitting.

Mrs. T. was cooperative and quite candid concerning visitation but reserved concerning details of the marriage and divorce. Prior to the divorce, arrangements were made that the father could visit the children by picking them up and returning them the same day if he phoned a day in advance. No frequency was specified. Since the divorce, this has happened only once and no request was made over the holidays. Mrs. said that the father is not interested in the children except that he has to support them. She described the father as "emotionally immature" and "not really capable of taking on a father role." Mrs. said the children have adjusted well to being without their father, and that the grandfather has always been much more interested in them. She was quite candid in saying her parents had not approved of the marriage.

The interviewer noted considerable emotional effect on the part of this young woman when discussing her ex-husband. There seemed to be considerable bitterness. Despite the fact that visiting "any time he want to" was stated, there was the feeling that Mrs. was much relieved that the father has not been interested in visiting. She impressed the

interviewer as being highly intelligent and somewhat aggressive. She doubted that her ex-husband would want to be interviewed but said she had no objections.

Case #18

Interviewer: A.W.

Type: Non-Custodial Father Divorced 1969

Mr. T. is a 41 year old steel job contractor who was married for the second time for a period of 13 years. His three children--boys 12 and 9 and a girl, age 11--plus a step-daughter from his wife's first marriage all live with the mother.

This man had indicated during our phone conversation that his relationship with the wife was very amicable, that he spent virtually every night of the week at her home, and that there was a possibility the two might remarry. Although he agreed to the interview, Mr. T. seemed rather strangely resistant to the idea of my coming to interview him at home or at his place of business or even on his side of town. It may have been merely as he said, that he is "out making estimates on jobs and it was easier for him to come to me." At any rate, we met in a cafe on southeast Division and 36th at 1:30 p.m. He sat with me in a booth making small talk about the weather, etc. and then there was silence as he appeared to wait for me to restate the purpose of our meeting. I did so briefly and his response was: "We have nothing formally set up on visitation. I can call anytime I like and come over any evening. I also take the kids with me on alternate weekends. That's about it."

He did not seem particularly guarded, though he was quite concise, and his affect was one of warmth and easy friendliness. He became even more at ease as we got further into the discussion. He stated that he felt, after I let him read "Some Reminders," that visitation arrangements were now and should continue to be closely tied

to support payments, not only in his own case but in divorce cases in general. He felt that failure or refusal to pay should be cause for cessation of visitation rights. He felt that even in "honest" cases of inability to pay, the non-custodial parent should be limited in his visitation rights. This feeling apparently stemmed from his experience regarding his stepdaughter, whom he says was allowed visitation with her father even though the father was grossly remiss in his support payments.

Mr. T. describes his children as "taking it in stride" in regard to the divorce between their mother and himself. He said that one of the influencing factors in the visitation setup between the two was transportation. He said his ex-wife had not had a driver's license or car at the time of their divorce; he drove her to shop and to other places she had to go. Now she has a license and her own car and is more independent. A note of resentment came into his conversation as he told how many of his weeknight visits were now merely devices the wife used to get him to babysit for her while she went bowling or participated in other activities. When I openly asked how he felt about this arrangement, he admitted his dislike for the situation.

This father says that none of the relatives on either side of the family are hostile or cause any trouble, but some of his wife's friends are frequently "meddling" and giving her advice that she shouldn't let him visit so often. He appeared resentful of that, too; however, it appears he will take his visits even if it means he is "merely being used as a babysitter." Strangely, later in the conversation, when he became more warm and open, he reversed this attitude by saying that he felt visitation in general should be a limited thing. He said that he feels he

sees his own kids too much now. "They see me more and have gotten it better since the divorce than they ever did when I was home."

Mr. T. claims that he and his wife did not obtain any marital counseling prior to their divorce. He wishes they had, saying, "We would have stayed together and worked out our problems if we had gotten counseling." He claims that neither he nor his wife was aware of the counseling available through the Family Services Department of the court. He also expressed some exasperation over the fact that he was not notified of the time of the divorce. He asked me if there wasn't a law that both parties to the proceedings be notified of the time of the hearing. He says that his wife did not inform him, although they conversed frequently before the hearing, because she assumed he had been notified by the court. He asked if I thought he could get an appointment with Judge Lewis regarding this matter.

As to the cause of the divorce, Mr. T. states that he feels his changing jobs about one and one-half to two years ago, requiring that he work long hours, contributed greatly to the downfall of the marriage. He feels that he has grown accustomed to the new job now and isn't under as much pressure. He feels that his wife and kids would also become accustomed to his routine and that they could make a go of it.

Case #19

Interviewer: A. W.

Type: Custodial Mother Divorced 1969

Although this 45 year old woman who was married 24 years was divorced in 1969, she was separated for two years before that. She has a married daughter, age 24, but has custody of a 16 year old daughter. She is a cook at a restaurant-bar. Her ex-husband, age 55, is a nurseryman.

Mrs. S., though she had been cooperative on the phone, was somewhat resistant and mildly hostile when I arrived on her doorstep. When she came to the door, she looked at me rather angrily. I commented that I was the man who had spoken to her the previous evening on the phone about the research project on visitation. She just stood there in the door with what seemed to be a "defiant" look, as though to bar my entrance. After a long pause, I said "Do you mind if I come in and talk to you as we agreed on the phone?" She began to back away and said that it would be alright, but she had just gotten up and would have to get ready to go to work and to send her daughter off to a babysitting job. I remarked that our talk would be very brief, but that it would help our study of visitation a great deal if she could tell us some of her experiences with it. By this time I was inside and she had motioned for me to sit down. It was evident she had more or less resigned herself to having to put up with this interview. She eyed me suspiciously and said, "I hope there ain't gonna be no trouble over this, now." I restated the policy of confidentiality and re-explained the purpose of the interview and this seemed to allay her fears somewhat.

This divorced mother indicated that her visitation arrangement with her ex-husband was "satisfactory" for all concerned. He never has come to her apartment to visit the 16 year old. Rather, the older daughter takes her younger sister out to his place for a few hours about once every two months. They see him during holidays like Thanksgiving, Christmas, and on birthdays. "But that's about all." There were no specific arrangements set up by the court and the present arrangement is purely informal, developing spontaneously out of the family's interaction. Although Mrs. S. says she "carries no grudge," she commented that she and her ex-mate "rarely see each other." The daughters began going to see the father for visits long before the divorce became official last year. They did so mainly because they wanted to see him occasionally, but he never came to see them. The visits occur "at the whim" of the daughters, irregularly.

Mrs. S. said she had no problems with support payments nor with other people like relatives or friends. No special factors influence the visitation arrangement. Mrs. S. had no suggestions as to how the court could help divorced couples set up their visitation more effectively. She feels that the children have "adjusted well" to things as they are and have never really exhibited any adverse reaction to either parent since the time of the divorce.

This lady related all of these facts and opinions in the briefest form possible and it was obvious she desired to give as little information as possible. Even with her chance to inspect the "Reminders" outline, plus additional prompting, there was no further response from her.

Case #20

Interviewer: A. W.

Type: Custodial Mother Divorced 1969

This 51 year old woman was married for 33 years to a man who has been a patient in the Oregon State Hospital for 20 years--off and on--with a diagnosis of paranoid schizophrenia. He was hospitalized at the time of the interview. The custodial mother was employed as a secretary for a TV station and has always supported her family. There is only one minor child, a daughter age 14; however, there are older married siblings. The father stays with these considerably older children when he is "home" or he is in a boarding house. The father has never supported the family and there are no support payments in this situation.

Visitation takes place on a "definite schedule" but one which is unusual. It is limited to holidays and is arranged by the mother by telephone. Visits are rare because of these limitations. The visits take place in the mother's home with the mother present. She will not allow the daughter to be with the father alone. Activities are just ordinary household goings on. This pattern has existed for some time and is not changed by the legal action of the formal divorce.

This woman was rather amused by an interview concerning visitation since she feels that it is the least of her worries. She is determined to have this younger daughter spared some of the emotional turmoil the older children experienced because of her husband's mental illness. She expresses considerable sympathy for him, but she is firm about this point as well as the fact that she resents the alleged fact that the mental hospital has "expected" her to take her husband back on

visits. Actually, she reports she tried to divorce him for years but felt frustrated by the earlier requirements of the law. She has tried to bring the children up to respect the father and understand his mental illness, i. e. behavior "not his fault." She seemed open, outspoken, realistic, but not embittered. Her only hostility was for the legal code she had found frustrating and her view of the hospital's position.

Case # 21

Interviewer: A. W.

Type: Custodial Mother Divorced 1969

This 23 year old woman had been separated for two years of her three and one-half year marriage which ended in September, 1969. She has custody of her three year old son. She lives with her parents and she works as a nurses aide in a local hospital. The father lives in a city a few miles away but allegedly has not paid child support despite the fact there is a support order which is to go through the County Clerk's Office.

Visits are arranged by the mother who takes the child to the other city without notifying the father ahead of time. There is no definite schedule. The visitation takes place at the father's apartment or some outing which is not necessarily child centered. The mother is always present during visiting and maintains responsibility. She does not feel that the father would know how to take care of his young son. Although there has been no change since the formal divorce, earlier there was no contact between father and son because the young mother's parents were so opposed to the father's coming to their home.

The mother describes her relationship with her ex-mate as "friendly and amicable." The child is seen as making a bid for attention during the visits by "showing off" and is hard to discipline after the visits, although there has been some improvement in this reaction. The main problem the mother reports is the father's failure to pay child support.

It was difficult to understand this mother's relationship to her ex-husband. She was reserved and volunteered little information and that seemed inconsistent. She said she would like to set a regular

visiting schedule but that the father is more "casual." She is the one who arranges the visits, however, at times of her choosing. She said that she would permit more frequent visiting if child support were paid but that she would not completely block contact with the father even if support were never paid. Her parents have expressed very strong negative feelings about the ex-husband and their resistance to his visiting is in part their fear that there might be a reconciliation. They fear she will return to live with him. She has been trying to convince her parents that she has no intentions of returning to her ex-husband. She says he is more interested in visiting with her than in seeing their son. The whole picture suggests that there is a lot about the visiting arrangements and their meaning that this interviewee was not willing to discuss.

Case #22

Interviewer: A. W.

Type: Custodial Mother Divorced 1969

This 34 year old woman was married for 12 years to a college professor and has custody of three daughters, age 14, 10, and 7.

The oldest daughter was from a previous marriage but was adopted by the ex-husband now in question. Her first husband died accidentally. At present this woman is not gainfully employed but she plans to work. The father lives in a small apartment in the same college town and makes regular support payments, ordered in the decree, through the County Clerk's office.

Visitation follows no definite schedule. Visits are arranged by telephone ahead of time by the father. On one occasion he dropped in without prior arrangement. The visits are made at his convenience primarily. The visits are about once a week in the short time since the divorce (less than six months). Usually the visits are at the custodial mother's home but sometimes they involve outside activities, including special outings or attending church. There has been no change in pattern in this short observation period. There have been no birthdays yet. Father spent Christmas Eve, attended mass and spent Christmas day with the family.

Special problems that the mother reported are the fact that the father has not "accepted" the divorce. Also his apartment is too small to accommodate visiting there. There is continued friction between the parents. The relationship is "bitter" and acrimonious. The friction does not concern visitation per se. The children are pictured as being "upset" by the quarreling, especially the oldest girl who often refuses

to participate in family visitation.

This couple continues to maintain the same sort of conflict that existed prior to the divorce. The mother, although having been the one to obtain the divorce, is finding it very difficult to cope with the household and three children without her husband. There had been problems in the marriage for many years and she had obtained marriage counseling, or rather personal therapy, since her husband had refused to participate. She feels that it would be much better to have a regular visiting schedule and to have him visit the children when she was not present. Although he takes more interest in the children now than before the divorce, she feels that he visits primarily to see her. However, they almost always have bitter fights during the visits. She feels too that he should obtain a larger house or apartment so that he can take the children to his home to visit rather than always coming to her house. He gets angry if she leaves while he is visiting and she feels she is not able to "put her foot down and stand up to him," apparently a carry-over from their difficulties during marriage. She says that it is her fault that he did not take more responsibility for the children during their marriage because she undertook too much of their care "in order not to bother him with it." She feels that he is equally interested in visiting his stepdaughter as he is in seeing his own children. He frequently talks to her on the phone.

The mother feels that her relationship with her ex-husband is more bitter now than prior to the divorce. She is very disillusioned about marriage and does not believe that anyone is happily married. Her own parents and her ex-husband's parents were unhappily married and most of her friends seem to be.

This mother felt that the court should set up visiting arrangements during the first months of divorce when feelings are more favorable for working out a "reasonable" arrangement.

Case #23

Interviewer: G. H.

Type: Custodial Mother Divorced 1969

This 45 year old mother of a boy 15 and a girl 10 was married 24 years and divorced in 1969 but separation occurred two years ago. She returned to college since the separation, and is now student teaching in the process of gaining a teaching certificate. Her husband is a 45 year old physician. The custodial mother and children live in an upper class or upper middle class residential neighborhood. The mother appeared relaxed, open and cooperative with the interview.

Visiting occurs whenever father and children want to get together--he calls the kids or they call him. In fact, they can see him almost any day because they can stop at his office on the way home from school. Visiting seems to be on a casual basis, but father takes them out of the home, often to the Multnomah Club fencing or out to dinner. He also takes them to his beach home for weekends, and he takes the son hunting. The father seems very interested in the adolescent development of the kids. The mother says she is interested and wants children to have a father image.

She said the children were used as pawns at the beginning when feelings were running high, but that now she would consider their relationship pleasant. (Although, it seemed she hesitated on that word, and I feel perhaps businesslike would be more like it.)

Father does have a girlfriend whom he takes to the beach with the kids and this does bother the ex-wife, "because of how the kids might feel about this," I was wondering too if she were not having some rather strong feelings and might still be emotionally involved.

When I asked what "meaningful visitation" might mean to her, she said what can be worked out amiable works out best for the benefit of everyone, that she hoped the court does not set down rules in regard to visiting, because she feels everything that is good about their arrangement comes from the fact that they have in a sense worked together.

She also mentioned that although the children were upset when they were first separated, that time takes care of many things and especially if the parents are mature in their understanding of the children's needs.

Case # 24

Interviewer: G. H.

Type: Custodial Mother Divorced 1969

This 20 year old mother, with the custody of an eight-month old son, was married for two years and divorced in August 1969. They actually lived together just eight months. She also has an older child from a previous marriage. She is not employed outside the home but plans to take training in nursing in the future. The father, now 23, is an electrical repairman for a large corporation. He makes support payments but this is supplemented by a welfare grant.

This mother feels visitation is wrong when child is only a baby because she cannot have her husband come there to visit because of older child who feels unwanted by ex-husband. Nevertheless, the father visits every Sunday. He must take the child out and he doesn't understand the child's needs, such as bottle, diapering, etc., and she is displeased when he brings the boy home. She doesn't feel he cares for the child other than showing him off. While they were married, he is said to have ignored the older child which was not his own.

The reason for divorce is stated as the father's mistreatment of Tony, older boy, who is now two and a half years. Also, the interviewee feels his mother-in-law broke up the marriage because she could not stand to lose the son.

She also says her husband's only interest in visiting is to come to see her, but she has no feeling for him other than "just another person." (I personally believe this is one reason she wants him to take the eight month old baby out.)

She would like to take visitation rights away from the father, but he would "just take it to court and try to prove her an unfit mother." She

"doesn't want any trouble." Visitation is a bitter struggle.

She talked a good deal on how people change after marriage-- that before marriage he was "so good to her and good to the older child."

APPENDIX G

PROTOTYPE INTERVIEW SCHEDULES

What follows is an interview schedule composed of questions and ideas drawn from various reference sources, as well as from out own knowledge and experience. This schedule was put together after the twenty-four interviews had been completed. The twenty-four interviews were done with only the most brief and flexible guidelines for the interviewer and respondent. It was hoped in those first interviews that a more unstructured approach would elicit more of the respondents' feelings as to where attention should be focused in this study.

Thus, this prototype schedule, as a composite of interview experiences plus readings on the subject, covers the subject of visitation in great breadth and depth. In its present form, it is obviously too lengthy to be utilized effectively in an actual interview situation. Many of the items of concern in this schedule will need modification or omission to make the schedule less cumbersome. Like this entire study, this schedule is merely an initial stage and will require much more work for refinement.

At this point, there should be mention of those to whom we are indebted to in the construction of the interview questionnaire. Interview schedules which appeared in Barfield and Morgan's Early Retirement, The Decision and The Experience and After Divorce, study by William J. Goode, were used as models for this schedule. Since Barfield and Morgan's subject matter did not relate specifically to our own, we used their schedule mainly as a guide to our questions

on demographic information. Goode, however, had an excellent ten-page questionnaire on post-divorce adjustment and this was incorporated in the form of numerous questions, many of them verbatim.

Perhaps the most helpful reference, in terms of a guideline to future interviewing for those who follow up this study, would be The Interviewer's Manual. This document was compiled at the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research in 1969. The principles it proposed for carrying out such an interview are worth repeating here. "The first step in the interviewing process involves setting up a friendly relationship with the respondent and getting him to cooperate in giving the needed information. It is at this time that you must do a job of selling yourself and the survey."

(1) "The respondent needs to feel that his acquaintance with the interviewer will be pleasant and satisfying." This includes a need for the interviewer to appear understanding, interested in the interviewee's responses, and to get the interviewee interested in the study. "Hopefully, you can get the respondent to see the interview as a real opportunity to express his views."

(2) "The respondent needs to see the survey as being important and worthwhile." Much of this would be accomplished by convincing him of your honesty and approachability as a person, your competence as an interviewer, and of the fact that you think the project is worthwhile.

(3) "Barriers to the interview in the respondent's mind need to be overcome." The interviewer needs to be sensitive to the respondent's point of view in answering his questions. One overriding thought to keep in mind is that "...the respondent may well remember more about

the interviewer and about how the interview was conducted than they will about the topics covered in the interview. "

Among the characteristics of a good interviewing relationship, the Manual cited the following: "Warmth and responsiveness on the part of the interviewer...a permissive atmosphere in which the respondent feels completely free to express any feeling or viewpoint...freedom from any kind of pressure or coercion. The interviewer in no way states his ideas, reactions, or preferences. " Particularly difficult to withhold, in this last category, are the all-important nonverbal indications of our feelings. A raised eyebrow, a smirk, or merely a look of surprise or dismay may affect many or all of the responses that follow such a subtle expression of interviewer opinion.

With regard to the mechanics of introducing the interview and then utilizing the interview schedule itself, the Manual makes the following observations:

On introductory procedures, "Tell the respondent who you are and who you represent. Tell him what you are doing...tell how the respondent was chosen...use letters from other respondents and clippings (as introductory devices). Doorstep introductions should be brief. "

In using the questionnaire, "...use the questionnaire but use it informally. Ask the questions exactly as worded in the questionnaire. Ask the questions in the order presented in the questionnaire. Repeat and clarify questions which are misunderstood or misinterpreted. " In changing from one subject or one area of questions to another, "use transition statements. "

On probing, "Probes have two major functions: (1) Probes motivate the respondent to communicate more fully so that he enlarges on what he has said, or clarifies what he has said, or explains the reasons behind what he has said. (2) Probes focus the discussion on the specific content of the interview so that irrelevant and unnecessary information can be eliminated. "

Interview Schedule (Non-Custodial Parent)

I. Demographic information about respondent and family:

How long have you lived in Portland?

How long at this address?

What kind of area did you grow up in? (rural, small town, city)

Sex of Respondent:

Age:

How much formal schooling have you had:

Completed college (if so, degree obtained)

Some college

Completed high school

Some high school

Completed elementary school

5-7 years elementary school

1-4 years elementary school

No formal schooling

If employed, what is your present occupation? (probe: full or part-time, specific type of work and business)

What type of work is it?

How long at that job?

If not employed, what specific type of work do you usually do?

Last previous occupation (probe for specifics as above)

How long at that job?

Since the divorce, have you or others close to you had any illness, or experienced any other unusual circumstances which have interrupted your employment?

For what period of time was your employment interrupted by this?

Was there any such event which interrupted your employment during marriage?

For what period of time?

Have any of the above described events or others interfered with your relationship to the children since the divorce?

For what period of time?

Has your job at any time interfered with your relationship with the children?

How?

For what period of time?

Interviewer's impressions regarding responses in Section I.

Candor or honesty to questions in this section was at a:

- high level
- sometimes high level
- sometimes low level
- low level

Resistance or guardedness was at a:

- high level
- high and low level
- low level

Ability to understand questions was at a:

- high level
- high and low level
- low level

Respondent's affect was:

- relaxed, but flat
- relaxed and interested
- anxious and interested
- anxious and irritated

Rapport between respondent and interviewer was:

- good
- fair
- poor

II. Visitation arrangements

How often in the past have you been able to visit your children?

How frequently have you been able to see them recently?

Does that hold true for the children?

What differences are there among them as to the frequency of your visits, if any?

How has this pattern changed over time since the divorce or separation?

How do you feel about the visitation arrangement as it is now?

How did you feel about the way it was earlier?

At the time of the decree, who decided how the visitation arrangements should be?

- you
- ex-spouse
- judge
- lawyer
- other

How do you feel about how that decision was reached?

How did you feel about it at the time?

How does the visitation get arranged each time now? (probe to find out who initiates)

How do you feel about that?

How has this changed over time?

How do you feel about the changes?

Where does visitation usually take place?

- your home
- ex-spouse's home
- elsewhere

What do you and the children usually do during visitation?

What sorts of things did you do with the children when you were married?

What sorts of things does your ex-spouse do with the children now?

What sorts of things did she do with them when you were married?

Who is usually present when you visit the children?

- ex-spouse
- new love interest of hers

new love interest of yours
relatives
friends
others

How do you feel about that?

How has this changed over time?

How do you and your ex-spouse arrange visitation, if any, during special occasions?

holidays
vacations
kids' or parents' birthdays

How do you feel about this?

How has this changed over time?

What could make visitation easier than it presently is?

attitudes of parties involved
attitudes of relatives
attitudes of children
counseling
laws
travel

If visitation is going well for you, what makes it so?

If it is going well, how can you see that it could have been more difficult if circumstances were different?

What people have played an important part in whether your visitation arrangements have gone well or not?

What has been their role?

What aids or obstacles do you feel exist in setting up visitation arrangements?

distance
money
transportation
time
attitudes

Can you remember a particularly pleasant visit between yourself and the children?

What made it pleasant?

Can you remember a particularly unpleasant visit?

What caused the unpleasantness?

How do you understand the court's decree regarding visitation?

how specific was it
who decided the arrangements

Would you rather see the children (more, less, about the same) as you do now?

Interviewer's impressions regarding responses to Section II.

Candor or honesty to questions in this section was at a:

high level
high and low level
low level

Resistance or guardedness was at a:

high level
high and low level
low level

Ability to understand questions was at a:

high level
high and low level
low level

Respondent's affect was:

relaxed, but flat
relaxed and interested
anxious and interested
anxious and irritated

Rapport between interviewer and respondent was

good
fair
poor

III. Welfare of the children

Which children are at home with your ex-spouse? (ages and sexes)

Which were at home at the time of the divorce?

Which ones do you have visitation with?

How do you feel the children are doing, generally? (probe: what problems, good experiences with regard to home, father, mother, school, friends, each other, etc.)

How is the current visitation arrangement affecting their welfare? (probe: .re individual children)

How do you feel about this?

What is the children's opinion of their mother?

What is their opinion of you?

How has visitation affected this opinion?

How did the children feel about their mother when you were married?

How did they feel about you then?

How do you find yourself handling the children during visitation?

reasonably
too permissive
too harsh (probe for individual differences)

How do you feel you treated them during the marriage?

How do you feel your wife treats them now?

How did you feel she treated them during your marriage?

How is the children's behavior during visitation?

easier than at home
no change
more difficult

Do you know how they behave with your ex-spouse after visitation?

easier
more difficult
no change

How is their normal behavior with her?

How did they behave during the marriage?

What is the major difference in the children's lives now as compared to when you were married?

What do they think about their situation now as compared to then?

What does visitation mean to them?

How could visitation be better set up to benefit them?

From their point of view, what is wrong with the visitation arrangement?

From your point of view?

From their mother's point of view?

From the children's point of view, what is the most beneficial thing about the present arrangement?

How has the relationship between you and the children been affected by visitation?

favorably
unfavorably
not at all

How has visitation affected the children's relationship with their mother?

favorably
unfavorably
not at all

How has visitation affected the children's relationship among themselves?

favorably
unfavorably
not at all

Interviewer's impressions regarding responses in Section III

Candor or honesty to questions in this section was at a:

high level
sometimes high, sometimes low level
low level

Resistance or guardedness was at a:

high level
high and low level
low level

Ability to understand questions was at a:

high level
high and low level
low level.

Respondent's affect was:

relaxed, but flat

relaxed and interested
anxious and interested
anxious and irritated

Rapport between interviewer and respondent was:

good
fair
poor

IV. Parental Relationship with Each Other

How long had you known your ex-spouse prior to marriage?

How long were you engaged?

How old was she when you married? How old were you?

What type of area did your wife grow up in?

small town
rural
city

How much formal schooling did she have?

completed college (degree)
some college
completed high school
some high school
completed elementary school
5-7 years elementary school
1-4 years elementary school
no schooling

What was her usual occupation, if she worked?

Did she work much while you were married? (probe: full or part time, number of months or years worked while married, kind of occupation.)

Average weekly or monthly combined income when you were married?

What is your weekly or monthly income now?

How much support or alimony do you pay?

Do you feel you have enough to live on?

Do you feel your wife has enough to live on?

Does she feel she has enough to live on?

How would you describe your relationship with your former spouse now?

bitter
indifferent
friendly

How has this changed since the divorce?

Why has it so changed?

How many months prior to the filing had your former spouse considered divorce?

How many months prior to the filing had you considered divorce?

How many months prior to the filing had you definitely decided on divorce?

Which of you first suggested divorce? (respondent, ex-wife, mutual)

Later on, which of you continued to insist on divorce?

Did either of you consult a marriage counselor or other clinical advice before the divorce?

From whom did you seek advice or help?

Were you aware that the court had a conciliation service?

Had you considered using it?

Why or why not?

What was the counseling advice you did receive?

patch it up
hang on for the sake of the children
get a divorce

When did you separate?

before the decision to divorce
between the decision and the filing
between the filing and the decree
after the decree
never separated

After finally settling on a divorce, did you and your former spouse talk about the details of the divorce?

If so, what did you discuss most often?

division of property

effects on the children
 alimony or support
 remarriage of one or both of you
 seeing each other after the divorce

What arrangement did you agree upon in the above matters?

Did your former spouse live up to these agreements since the divorce?

Were you able to live up to these agreements?

Please try to match the people listed below to the kind of feeling that best describes them on the opposite side of the page:

With regard to the divorce, these people felt as follows:

Her family	a. strong approval
Your family	b. mild approval
Her friends	c. indifference
Your friends	d. mild disapproval
Mutual friends	e. strong disapproval
Pastor	
Co-workers	
Others (specify)	

Now match the same people to their feelings about the marriage a few years earlier:

In your own words, the main cause of the divorce was: (probe: "anything else?")

What would your former spouse say?

Was there any separation during the marriage due to work or service or other circumstance?

Why?

For how long?

With regard to the custody of children, who decided this matter?

you
 former spouse
 mutual
 judge
 lawyer
 other

Was this agreement acceptable to all parties? If not, explain:

Interviewer's perception of responses in Section IV:

Candor or honesty to questions in this section was at a:

high level
sometimes high, sometimes low level
low level

Resistance or guardedness was at a:

high level
high and low level
low level

Ability to understand questions was at a:

high level
high and low level
low level

Respondent's affect was:

flat and relaxed
relaxed and interested
anxious and interested
anxious and irritated

Rapport between respondent and interviewer was:

good
fair
poor

V. Respondent's Individual Adjustment

How would you describe your physical health now?

good
fair
poor

How was it before the divorce?

How is your emotional condition at present?

good
fair
poor

How was this before the divorce?

Have you noticed any change of personal habits of any kind since the divorce?

an increase or decrease in the amount you smoke
an increase or decrease in the amount you drink
an increase or decrease in the amount you eat
an increase or decrease in the amount you sleep

How would you describe your social life since the divorce?

Have you had difficulty combating loneliness since the divorce?

Is your employment situation changed now from what it was prior to the divorce?

working more
working less
about the same
change of occupation

In your opinion, is this better or worse than your job situation before the divorce?

Do you have financial problems?

To whom have you turned for help in this area?

Whom would you consider turning to for that kind of help?

Would you ask your former spouse for help with such difficulties?

Would you consider remarrying?

If so, for what reason?

Would you consider remarrying your former wife?

How would things have to change for you feel that way?

If you are already remarried, how would you compare the two marriages?

Would you say that you were able to change your approach to the new marriage as opposed to the former marriage?

How so?

Would you say you have benefited by what happened in the earlier marriage?

How so?

Interviewer's impressions of responses in Section V:

Candor or honesty to questions in this section was at a

high level
sometimes high, sometimes low level
low level

Resistance or guardedness was at a:

high level
high and low level
low level

Ability to understand questions was at a:

high level
high and low level
low level

Respondent's affect was:

relaxed, but flat
relaxed and interested
anxious and interested
anxious and irritated

Rapport with respondent was:

good
fair
poor

VI. Recommendations to the court regarding judicial decision, the attorney's role, and use of conciliation services.

What are some of the most important things you recall about the process of getting a divorce, from the beginning of filing until the day of the final decree?

How could the court people have helped set the visitation arrangements more effectively then?

How would you recommend that the divorce process be changed?

Interviewer's impressions regarding responses in Section VI.

Candor or honesty to questions in this section was at a:

high level
sometimes high, sometimes low level
low level

Resistance or guardedness was at a:

high level
high and low level
low level

Ability to understand questions was at a:

high level
high and low level
low level

Respondent's affect was:

relaxed, but flat
relaxed and interested
anxious and interested
anxious and irritated

Rapport between interviewer and respondent was:

good
fair
poor

Interviewer: Note where this interview took place, who was present, what was the date and time of the interview, how long did it take.

Interview Schedule (Custodial Parent)

I. Demographic information about respondent and family:

How long have you lived in Portland ?

How long at this address?

What kind of area did you grow up in? (rural, small town, city)

Sex of Respondent:

Age:

How much formal schooling have you had:

Completed college (if so, degree obtained)

Some college

Completed high school

Some high school

Completed elementary school

5-7 years elementary school

1-4 years elementary school

No formal schooling

If employed, what is present occupation? (probe: full or part-time, specific type of work)

How long at that job?

If not employed, what specific type of work do you usually do?

Last previous occupation (probe for specifics as above)

How long at that job?

Were you employed during the marriage? (probe: part or full-time, type of work, etc.)

How long at that job?

Have you, your spouse or children, or others in the home ever had any illness, or other unusual experiences which interrupted your employment ?

For what length of time was your employment interrupted by this?

How have the above described interruptions affected your relationships with the children?

favorably
unfavorably
not at all

When you worked, how much did your job interfere with your relationship with your children?

favorable affect
unfavorable affect
no affect at all

Interviewer's impressions regarding responses in Section I:

Candor or honesty to questions in this section were:

at a high level
sometimes high, sometimes low level
at a low level

Resistance or guardedness was:

at a high level
sometimes high, sometimes low
at a low level

Ability to understand questions was:

at a high level
sometimes high, sometimes low
at a low level

Respondents affect was:

relaxed, but flat
relaxed and interested
anxious and interested
anxious and irritated

Rapport between interviewer and respondent was:

good
fair
poor

II. Data About Visitation Arrangements

How often in the past month has your ex-spouse visited with the children?
(probe: Has this pattern changed over time since you were divorced or separated? Does it vary from one child to another?)

How do you feel about the visitation arrangement as it stands?

As it use to be?

At the time of divorce decree, who decided how the visitation should be arranged?

you
your ex-spouse
both
judge
lawyer
the conciliation service
other

How do you feel about how that decision was reached?

Who initiates each visitation now?

How has this changed over time?

How do you feel about how the visitation has changed over time?

Where does visitation usually take place?

your home
ex-spouse's home
elsewhere

What activities take place, if any, when your ex-spouse visits with the children?

What activities did he participate in with the children when you were married?

Do you do different things (activities) now with the children than when you were married?

What do you do now?

What did you do then?

Who is usually present when ex-spouse visits the children?

you
spouse's new love interest
maternal or paternal grandparents
other
none

How do you feel about that?

How has this changed over time?

How do you and ex-spouse arrange visitation, if any, during special occasions?

holidays
vacations
children's or parents' birthdays

How do you feel about this?

How has this changed over time?

What could make visitation easier than it is at present? (attitudes of parties involved, relatives, friends, kids, counseling, laws)

If visitation is going well for you, how can you see that it might have been more difficult for you? (What conditions might have been present?)

What people have played an important role in determining whether your visitation arrangements have gone well or poorly?

friends
relatives
children
you and spouse
others

What has been their role?

What aids and obstacles do you feel are present in setting up visitation arrangements?

distance
money
transportation
attitudes

Can you remember a particularly pleasant visit between your ex-spouse and the children?

What made it pleasant?

Can you remember a particularly unpleasant visit?

What made it so unpleasant?

How do you understand the court's decree regarding your visitation? (how specific was it, who did decide the arrangements in it?)

Would you want your ex-spouse to see the children (more, less about the same) as he does at present?

Interviewer's impressions regarding responses in Section II.

Candor or honesty to questions in this section was at a:

high level
sometimes high, sometimes low level
low level

Resistance or guardedness was at a:

high level
high and low level
low level

Ability to understand questions was at a:

high level
high and low level
low level

Respondent's affect was:

relaxed, but flat
relaxed and interested
anxious and interested
anxious and irritated

Rapport between interviewer and respondent was:

good
fair
poor

III. Welfare of the Children

Which children are at home now? (age and sex of each)

Which children were home at the time of the divorce (age and sex of each)

How are the children doing now, generally? (probe: what problems, good experiences with regard to home, father, mother, school, friends, each other, etc.)

How is the current visitation arrangement affecting their well-being?

How does this vary from child to child?

How has this changed over time?

How do you feel about all this?

What is the children's opinion of your ex-spouse? (probe: individual differences among children, do they love him less? more? no change?)

How has visitation affected this opinion?

How did they feel about him when you were married? (probe for individual differences as above)

How does your ex-spouse treat the children during visitation?

overly generous and permissive
generous but reasonable
reasonable but not very generous
not reasonable nor generous

(probe for individual differences and changes over time since divorce)

How did your ex-spouse treat the children while you were married?
(again probe individual differences)

How is the children's behavior after visitation? (no change, harder to manage, easier to manage) probe for individual differences among children and changes over time.

How did they behave during your marriage as compared to now?

no change
harder to manage
easier to manage

(probe for individual differences)

What is the major difference in the children's lives now as compared to when you were married? (probe individual differences)

What do they think about their situation now as compared to then?
(ask about each child individually)

What does visitation mean to them? (ask about each child individually)

How could visitation be set up to better benefit them?

From their point of view, what is wrong with the visitation arrangement?

From your point of view, what is wrong with it?

From your ex-spouse's point of view?

From the children's point of view, what is the most beneficial thing about the present arrangement?

From your point of view?

From your ex-spouse's point of view?

How has the relationship between you and your children been affected by the visitation?

favorably
unfavorably
not at all

How has the visitation affected the children's relationship with the ex-spouse?

favorably
unfavorably
not at all

How has the visitation affected their relationship among themselves?

Interviewer's impressions regarding responses in Section III:

Candor or honesty was at a:

high level
high and low level
low level

Resistance or guardedness was at a:

high level
high and low level
low level

Ability to understand questions was at a:

high level
high and low level
low level

Respondent's affect was:

relaxed, but flat
relaxed and interested
anxious and interested
anxious and irritated

Rapport between interviewer and respondent was:

good
fair
poor

IV. Parental relationships with each other

How long had you known your ex-spouse before the marriage?

How long were you engaged?

How old was he when you married? How old were you?

What kind of area did your former spouse grow up in? (rural, small town, city)

How much formal schooling did he have?

completed college, degree
completed high school
some high school
completed grammar or elementary school
5-7 years of grammar school
1-4 years of grammar school
no formal schooling

What is his usual occupation? (be specific: type of work, business involved in)

Was he a steady worker while you were married? (always had worked, worked except for occasional layoffs, frequent layoffs, never worked for long periods)

His average weekly or monthly income while you were married?

His average income now?

Amount of support he pays you?

Amount of other income you now have?

Do you feel you have enough to live on?

How would you describe your relationship with your ex-spouse now?

bitter
indifferent
friendly

Why would you describe it so?

How has this changed since the divorce?

Why has this changed since the divorce?

How long before the filing did you yourself first consider divorce?

How many months before the filing did you definitely decide on divorce?

Which of you first suggested the idea of divorce?

respondent
ex-spouse
mutual

Later on, which of you continued to insist on divorce?

Did either of you consult a marriage counselor or other clinical advice before the divorce?

Where or from whom did you seek this advice?

Were you aware that the court offers a conciliation service?

Did you consider using it?

What was the advice you did receive in counseling? (try to patch it up, hang on for the kids' sake, get a divorce)

When was your separation?

before the decision to divorce
between the decision and the filing
between the filing and the decree
after the decree
never

After finally deciding on a divorce, did you and your former husband have talks about the details of the divorce?

If so, what did you discuss most often?

division of property
effect on the children
alimony or support
remarriage of one or both of you
seeing each other after divorce
visitation of children
other

What arrangement did you agree upon in the above matters?

Did your ex-spouse live up to these agreements since the divorce?
(all, most, some, none)

Were you able to live up to these agreements? (all, most, some, none)

In your own opinion, the main cause of the divorce was: (probe-- anything else?)

What would your ex-spouse say?

168

Was there any separation during the marriage due to work, service, illness, or other reason?

Why?

For how long?

With regard to the custody of each child, who decided this matter?

you
ex-spouse
mutual
judge
lawyer
other

Was this agreement acceptable to both parties?

If not, explain why:

Interviewer's perception regarding responses in Section IV:

Candor or honesty to questions were at a:

high level
sometimes high, sometimes low level
low level

Resistance or guardedness was at a:

high level
high and low level
low level

Ability to understand questions was at a:

high level
high and low level
low level

Respondent's affect was:

relaxed, but flat
relaxed and interested
anxious and interested
anxious and irritated

Rapport between interviewer and respondent was:

good
fair
poor

V. Respondent's Individual Adjustment

How would you describe your physical health now (good, fair, poor)

How has this changed, if any, since the divorce:

How would you describe your emotional condition at present? (good, fair, poor)

How has this changed since the divorce?

Have you noticed a change in any of your habits since the divorce?

an increase or decrease in the amount you smoke
an increase or decrease in the amount you drink
an increase or decrease in the amount you eat
an increase or decrease in the amount you sleep

Have you had problems with loneliness since the divorce?

Are you having to work more now than you did when married?

Is this causing any problems? What are they?

Do you think these problems you are experiencing now will be able to be worked out?

How are the children cared for?

Do you have financial problems?

To whom have you turned for help in this area?

To whom would you consider turning for help in this area?

Would you ask your former spouse to help with financial difficulties?

Would you consider remarrying to solve these problems?

If you are remarried now, how would you compare the two marriages?

Would you say you benefited in this marriage by what happened in the earlier marriage?

Interviewer's impressions of responses to questions in Section V.

Candor or honesty to questions was at a:

high level
sometimes high, sometimes low level
low level

Resistance or guardedness was at a:

high level
high and low level
low level

Ability to understand questions was at a:

high level
high and low level
low level

Respondent's affect was:

relaxed, but flat
relaxed and interested
anxious and interested
anxious and irritated

Rapport between interviewer and respondent was:

good
fair
poor

VI. Recommendations to the court--regarding judicial decisions and attorney's role and the use of the conciliation service

How do you think the court, or anyone working in conjunction with the court, could help your present situation regarding visitation arrangements? (Guidelines from the judge or the attorney, counseling from the conciliation services, etc.)

What are some of the most important things you recall about the process of getting the divorce, from the beginning of your filing until the day of the final decree?

How could the court have helped set the visitation arrangements more effectively then? (Guidelines, counseling, etc.)

How would you recommend that the divorce process be changed?

Interviewer's impressions regarding responses in Section VI:

Candor or honesty to questions in this area was at a:

high level
sometimes high, sometimes low level
low level

Resistance or guardedness was at a:

high level
high and low level
low level

Ability to understand questions was at a:

high level
high and low level
low level

Respondent's affect was:

relaxed, but flat
relaxed and interested
anxious and interested
anxious and irritated

Rapport between interviewer and respondent was:

good
fair
poor

Interviewer: Note where this interview took place, who was present, what was the date and time for the interview, and how long did it take?